THE CHRISTIAN EAST

VOL. II. NEW SERIES. NOS. 7 AND 8. WINTER, 1953–4

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE volume of valuable material in this issue leaves little space for Notes and Comments. Nor in the articles published do we cover anything like the whole field of the Orthodox Church. We must apologize for the gaps, and trust that in future issues we may restore the balance.

News of the disastrous Ionian Earthquake came too late for more than a passing mention in our last issue. This time we publish a short account from Fr. Embleton, an active member of A. & E.C.A., now a Naval Chaplain, who was quickly on the spot taking part in rescue work. We should also mention that a contribution of £25 was sent without delay by the Association to the Greek Embassy—money contributed over the last three years by Blackpool school children, and sent to the Secretary for the aid of children in less fortunate circumstances. May the gifts that we send be a token of recognition of our long and deep indebtedness to the brave Christian Greek people!

The Association marked its entry upon its ninetieth year with a particularly happy Festival, of which we publish an account from the *Eastern Churches Broadsheet*. If one Co-Editor may speak of his colleague in these columns, I would stress, what is there touched on somewhat lightly, the genuine warmth of gratitude and affection expressed on that occasion to our retiring Secretary, whose new vision of Orthodoxy, revealed to him in the City of Constantine, has been the vital factor behind the life of the Association since he took over the Secretaryship in 1945. While confidently wishing all success to our new Secretary, the Rev. Peter Hammond (and may our Ninetieth Year mark new developments in the realization of our mission to the Church of England!), we are very thankful to have Fr. Oakley still with us as Chairman of Committee.

The writer of these notes must express his own particular happiness at the warm words of encouragement offered at the General Meeting to *The Christian East* by Canon Douglas, who was for so many years its mainstay.

Our President, the Bishop of London, was present in cope and mitre both at the Festival Liturgy and, a month later, at the Pan-Orthodox Liturgy at the Serbian Church, when he preached the sermon, which with his permission we publish in these pages. Once more the Bishop has made it clear that he has accepted Presidency of our Association with heart and mind, not as a mere honorary position.

That Pan-Orthodox Liturgy gives us the excuse for devoting considerable space in this issue to the Serbian Church. Its history in this country is described by Fr. Nikolich. No other body of refugees has so called forth

our admiration by its readiness and resourcefulness in self-help, and its determination to be as little as possible dependent on others. And Fr. Rodzianko—who, as a Russian Priest attached to the Serbian Church, is specially fitted to speak of this—stresses the value, for the whole Orthodox Church, of Serbian insistence on retaining unbroken their canonical Unity.

We publish, *for documentation*, the letter of the Patriarch of Moscow to the Ecumenical Patriarch which lists the points now at issue between these two great branches of the Orthodox Church. We hope to be able to present Greek views on these same points in our next issue.

We are reminded that this year marks the ninth centenary of the excommunication of the Patriarch Michael Caerularius by the Papal Legate, Cardinal Humbert—the event which has long been regarded as marking the final split between the Eastern and Western Churches. Perhaps in our next issue we shall be able to discuss the accuracy of that view, and to publish something on the grounds and character of the tragic breach, in that spirit of fearless charity which, we believe, is now beginning to open a door of understanding between the divided Churches.

Of the greatest importance for this is the need for an increased knowledge in the West of the distinctive spirituality of the Eastern Orthodox Church. And in this connection, Fr. Basil Krivocheine's "Mystical Autobiography of St. Symeon the New Theologian," here published, appears to us of such significance that we are arranging for a large number of offprints, which will be on sale at a shilling each.

It is only right that in this issue of *The Christian East* we should offer our best wishes to the newly-consecrated Bishop of Gibraltar, the Right Reverend F. W. T. Craske, whose contacts with the Orthodox Church are bound to form a very important part of his work.[1] D.J.C.

EARTHQUAKE IN THE IONIAN ISLANDS

IN March, 1951, I set eyes on the Ionian Islands for the first time, as we passed through them on our way from Piraeus to Naples via the Corinth Canal, and we admired the grandeur of the mountains and the sheer beauty of the ensemble of many colours, so typical of Greece: we were on our honeymoon, and also we were leaving Greece for a considerable time. Shortly after dawn on Saturday, August 15th, 1953, I sighted the island of Zante (Zakynthos) again; but how altered were the circumstances. . . .

This time I was standing on the bridge of H.M.S. *Bermuda*, having been seconded by my Admiral as an interpreter and taking passage in this ship, which was loaded to the limit with food and supplies, and whose ship's company were to take part in relief work in the island of Zante. There was the island, a mile or so to port, looking at that distance much the same: mountains falling steeply to the blue sea, the cliffs occasionally scarred where the rock had recently fallen into the sea; the valleys and plain still beautiful in their variegated green, with here and there the white dots which denoted a house or farm. As we rounded the point, there was the town of Zante, looking incredibly normal, apart from the presence of little clouds

[1] We regret that inadvertently in our last issue we printed the late Bishop's first Christian name as Cyril instead of Cecil.

of smoke above it. Had there indeed been here a disaster of the first magnitude?

Then one of the watchkeepers lent me a pair of binoculars. The scene was quite different. The water-front was cracked and uneven, and the buildings facing were roofless, their walls cracked and distorted. Behind, the town was a tangled area of wreckage, still burning in places. The little white church on the hill, which looked so normal, had the appearance through the glasses of a boiled egg which has been well and truly cracked with a spoon but which yet retains its essential shape. In a few hours a natural disaster had accomplished what days of aerial bombardment could hardly have done.

When I got ashore the completeness of the disaster was brought home to me. In the town, earthquake and fire had done their very worst, and all was shattered; indeed, the fires were to continue sporadically for days. And in the whole island I saw not one house which was not damaged to greater or lesser degree—yet outside the town they had been spared the fire. Everywhere the survivors were gathered under the trees, with such furniture, food and bedding as they had been able to salvage. And, of course, the inevitable stench of death and broken sewers. The scene almost baffles description.

The first measures of relief were obvious: rescue of the buried-alive, medical attention, and the distribution of food. Then must follow the rehabilitation of the community, and the clearance of the rubble. All this is easily said; but the latter tasks will not be finished this year, or next. Nevertheless, a good start was made: parties of men continued to dig out the survivors from the ruins—some of them were buried without food or water for more than a week: others fought the fires; camps were established in open spaces on the outskirts of the town, where two hot meals a day were served and where people could rest and sleep in the tents; rough roads were cleared for the use of vehicles, so that communication could be established with the rest of the island; the dead were buried.

But of all this work in the town I saw very little, except the results; for it fell to my lot to be attached to the two helicopters which we had brought in *Bermuda* with us. In them we surveyed the whole island, evacuating the seriously injured, dropping an immediate dole of food, and reporting on the state of the damage and on the relief measures immediately required. It was a job at once saddening and very disheartening. For these tough peasants were not loudly complaining or demanding the earth. Their houses were mostly uninhabitable, and tremors still continued; but all they asked for were medical attention and bread (they had flour, but their primitive ovens had been cracked or destroyed) and tents (for the autumn was fast approaching, and we have heard since of the storms and torrential rains there). Outside the town, water and fruit and vegetables were plentiful, and the flocks had not suffered seriously. In the midst of disaster, the little courtesies common to life in these parts were not forgotten, nor had they ever seemed so touching and so sincere. And in village after village the "proedros" found a scrap of paper on which to pen a short letter of thanks to H.M. Queen Elizabeth and the British people: I hope they found their proper destination eventually!

Within a few days one was flying over hill-farms and the great fields of the plain where people were busy with the crops and laying out the currant harvest to dry: ironically (or rather Providentially) enough, it was apparently a bumper crop. . . .

And what of the Church? She is there. What more can one say? In every village the figure stepping out of the helicopter was greeted by the whole village *en masse*, but the discussion was between him and the "proedros" and the "papas" together. The latter's greeting was invariably the Kiss, on both cheeks, for the "papas anglikanos"!

Let us return to the town. On the last day I went once again to the great new church of St. Dionysius (the local saint), whose body lies embalmed in a glass case to the south of the Holy Table. This church was undamaged (one of three such buildings in the island: the others were a school and a bank), by virtue of its construction—although most said "by virtue of the holy Saint." This was the one place where the people could say their prayers in their traditional way, and assist at the Divine Mysteries in all their solemnity. And outside this church, huts were springing up, by the hands of more than one hundred schoolboys and students from Athens, led by Mr. Neris, the Crown Prince's tutor (whom I had not met since my wedding day), and with materials bought by the Queen of Greece's Fund. The situation typified "Worship and Work." I felt that, as I stooped to kiss the foot of the Saint, I was bidding *au revoir* to a community which is a *whole*.

Worship and Work. That should be our response. What I have written here is little; I saw only one island, even if the whole of it, and much has been written (and, I hope, read) about the 'quake. Funds have been opened in England, in addition to the standing "Queen's Fund": we should be generous towards them with such means as we may be the stewards of. And we should pray; particularly at the Offertory and at the Sursum Corda, as we offer the same Holy Eucharist on the same Lord's Day, for our Orthodox brethren in the Ionian Islands. Nor should we pray only for them, but also for ourselves, that we may learn from them a very great truth: for to the Holy Orthodox Church of the East, as to the Greek nation, disaster and suffering are no new things, and yet she has never been overcome by them, but rather purified and strengthened. May God the Holy Trinity grant us such unity in the Mystical Body of Him who suffered, rose and triumphed through and for the sufferings and sorrows of the whole world.

HAROLD EMBLETON,
Chaplain R.N.

FESTIVAL OF THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

(from The Eastern Churches "Broadsheet")

ENTERING on the ninetieth year of the Association's life, we have had an encouraging and happy Festival. For the success of this and for the welcome extended to us at the Greek Cathedral by the Metropolitan of

I U M S A F E T Y

Thyateira and the Dean of the Cathedral, the Archimandrite James Virvos, we have to thank our Orthodox friends. The Divine Liturgy was sung at 11 a.m. on Thursday, October 29th, by the Metropolitan himself, as Orthodox President of the Association, assisted in concelebration by eight priests, representing the autocephalous churches in this country. The music was severely Byzantine, sung by the clergy of the Cathedral, and provided a traditional background for the splendour of the Rite. The Bishop of London, attended by Dr. Prestige, Canon and Treasurer of St. Paul's, had his place on the north side of the choir. Until the Lesser Entry the Metropolitan was in his throne in choir and Bishop Matthew of the Polish Church in the *parathronion*. The Great Litanies were sung in Greek, Slavonic and English in turn, and the Epistle read by the Dean in English, the Gospel by Archimandrite Denys from the Throne. Many of our Greek and other Orthodox friends attended, besides members of the Association. We were also fortunate in the weather for so late in the year, and the sun shone most of the time, lighting up the marbles and rich mosaics of the Cathedral.

Immediately after the Divine Liturgy, a hot buffet lunch was provided in the Crypt of the Cathedral, the quality and ampleness of which was due to the kindness of a group of Greek and English ladies. After this the Association members gathered to listen to a paper read by the General Secretary, the Rev. Austin Oakley, on Byzantium—Constantinople—Istanbul. Beginning with the immortality which (like that of Old Rome and Jerusalem) has manifested itself in the city built on the Bosphorus twenty-five centuries ago, he touched on the importance for Christian history of the ancient Greek city of Byzantium, which after nearly a thousand years of chequered pagan history, became the capital of the Empire in the fourth century of our era, taking the name of Constantine's City. He reminded his hearers that five hundred years ago this year, that city fell to the Osmanli Turks and became Istanbul, a name in itself only the corruption of the Greek for "At the City"—the great City. By a conspicuous coincidence, October 29th, the day of the Festival, was the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of the Kemalist Turkish Republic, and the last part of the Secretary's paper was in sincere praise, not only of the enlightened and democratic government of Turkey to-day, the dream coming true of Mustapha Kemal, the Father of the Turkish people, but of the present wise, far-seeing and patriotic occupant of the Ecumenical Throne Athenagoras, to whom Christians in Turkey owe so much.

The Annual General Meeting followed with Canon Prestige in the chair. The first business, arising out of the Secretary's General Statement was his own resignation which he offered with sincere regrets. He explained that the step had two main reasons behind it, his long period of illness and poor health and also his desire to see a successor from a younger generation. He gave an account of the Association's condition since the last Festival two years ago, read a financial statement from the Treasurer, Mr. Langton, and presented the official accounts for 1952–3 for adoption. He also read a letter from the Rev. Peter Hammond (unfortunately absent through illness) who had already been approached by him on behalf of the General Committee, accepting, under certain provisos, the General Secretaryship, should

he be elected by the meeting. Fr. Hammond was proposed for the office by the Rev. H. M. Waddams, General Secretary of the Archbishop's Council for Foreign Relations, and seconded by the retiring Secretary of the Association. The meeting elected him unanimously. Bishop Buxton then spoke about Fr. Oakley in kind and warm terms and proposed that he should be elected to the Chairmanship of General Committee. This was seconded by Fr. Waddams and passed by the meeting. Canon J. A. Douglas, who was present in spite of ill-health, spoke kindly of Fr. Oakley and his work and recalled earlier days of the Association's activities and life. In returning thanks the out-going Secretary explained that he would continue to edit the Broadsheet and to act as co-editor of *The Christian East* which was being produced by the Rev. D. J. Chitty, and expressed himself glad of the opportunity of continuing to serve his successor and the Association in the office to which he had been elected.

It is of interest and value that our Association Festivals have by now found a pattern: Eucharistic worship together, a common social meal which has the elements of an Agápe, and our business meeting. Clearly this is something to be cherished, especially as it has come about spontaneously. It is primarily an act of worship, our association together being grounded on that, and the highest and most comprehensive act of worship of the Divine Trinity, the Eucharist. This in turn gives meaning to our social life and work and sanctifies it. We look forward to new vigour and enthusiasm and a closer knitting together of those who are working for true unity of heart and spirit.

PAN-ORTHODOX LITURGY AND YOUTH MEETING

(from an Orthodox correspondent)

THE 29th November was a wonderful day. Then for the first time in Western Europe the real beauty of the Catholic Unity of Orthodoxy was shown forth in its full splendour. The present Orthodox Church is a living example of the Catholic Church of the first ten centuries—different local Churches with their different languages and traditions, different policies of their states, different outlooks, and many other human differences . . . and yet, in spite of all, essential unity of Faith, of worship, of Holy Communion. That unity exists always. It is deeper than the small human misunderstandings which are known both to the past history of the Church, and to the Orthodox Church of our days. And it expresses itself in such great manifestations of Orthodoxy as in Moscow in 1948, or in the Serbian Church in London on the 29th November this year.

Members of all Orthodox nationalities living in Great Britain, of all autocephalous Churches and of all their different jurisdictions, actually took part in that service, organized by the Association of Orthodox Priests in Great Britain, under the presidency of the Greek Archbishop in this country, His Grace Athenagoras, Metropolitan of Thyatira, who, as the representative of the first Patriarch of the Orthodox Church, was himself the chief celebrant. Only the Greek Church was not represented by refugees, the Greeks present being residents in this country, and for the most part British

subjects. And of the refugee Churches, it was only the Serbian Church which was not either canonically separated from her home Church, or split into many groups—all the Serbs belonging to the one canonical body of their Church. Perhaps that was just the reason why their Church in London was chosen to be the place of the Pan-Orthodox Service: all other Orthodox, of all different parties, found it easy to come there, and were welcomed with equal joy.

Side by side with Archbishop Athenagoras stood another Bishop, the Right Reverend Matthew, from Poland. The Orthodox Church in that country (where Orthodoxy is found mostly in the Eastern parts) became autocephalous by decree of the Patriarch of Constantinople in the early 'twenties. After the Second World War, it sought and received recognition of that status from the Patriarchate of Moscow. To that Orthodox Church of Poland Bishop Matthew belongs, though for political reasons he is cut off from relations with his home Church. Similar is the position of the Estonian and Latvian priests, Fr. Hindo and Fr. Gramatins. The Orthodox Churches in the Baltic states, separated politically, in the period between the Wars, from their Mother Church in Russia, were, like the Churches of Poland and Finland, recognized as autonomous by the Ecumenical Patriarch: but they are now again under the Moscow jurisdiction. Fr. Hindo and Fr. Gramatins speak Estonian and Latvian as their native languages, and represent the Baltic refugees of the Orthodox faith. They also are, for political reasons, out of relations with their home Churches, but spiritually still belong to them.

The Rumanian Church is an old historic Church with a long tradition of her own and with her own Patriarchate. The Rumanians are the only Latin people within the Orthodox Communion, and are in that sense representatives of "Western Orthodoxy": their mentality is much more "Western" than that of the Greeks or Slavs. The Rumanian Priest in London, Fr. Galdau, remained in Bucharest after the War and suffered much before escaping to this country as a refugee. He likewise cannot have relations with his Patriarchate, but does definitely represent his Church.

The Russians in this country have two jurisdictions—that of the Moscow Patriarchate, and that of the "Russian Church in Exile" with its headquarters in America. They share the same Church in Buckingham Palace Road, but do not hold services together: those of the Moscow jurisdiction claim that they have nothing to do with politics, but want to be in no sense separated from their Mother Church. This time the representative of the "Russian Church in Exile," Archimandrite Nikodim, was one of the concelebrants, while the Archimandrite Nicolas Gibbs, of the Moscow jurisdiction, was present, together with many individual members of that Russian congregation. Some of them sang in the choir together with members of the other Russian jurisdiction, and with Serbs and Rumanians. Fr. Antony Bloom, the parish priest of the Moscow jurisdiction in London, could not be present at the Liturgy, as it was his turn that Sunday to celebrate in the Russian Church. But he came later to join in the Agape-luncheon and the Pan-Orthodox Meeting.

The Serbian Church was represented by three priests: Archpriest M.

Nikolich, who, as representative of the Patriarch Vikenty, is head of the Serbian Church in Great Britain; his assistant Priest, Fr. Vladimir Rodzianko; and Fr. Justinian Ilkich, who was in London on his way to Canada.

An Ukrainian group, which is under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch, was represented at the service. The Ukrainian Archpriest, Fr. Hubarzevsky, a refugee from the Ukraine after the Second World War, was one of the concelebrants.

The service was celebrated in many languages—but mostly in English as a common language for all Orthodox in Great Britain. It was sung by three choirs—those of the Serbian Church in London, of the Serbian Youth Movement, and of the Pan-Orthodox Youth movement, "Syndesmos": some members of the choirs of other national Churches joined the choir of the Serbian Church. The "Syndesmos" choir sang all in English. The music was the traditional music of the different Orthodox Churches. Particularly beautiful was the "Trisagion" sung in Greek by a female trio in reply to the words of blessing sung by the Archbishop in his impressive tenor voice—the blessing with the "trikerion" and "dikerion," the three and two candles, representing the Three Persons of the Godhead and the Two Natures of our Lord, which distinguishes the Byzantine pontifical rite.

The Creed was recited in English in the middle of the church by Fr. V. Rodzianko; the Epistle in Church Slavonic (Serbian style) by the choirmaster of the Serbian Youth Choir, Mr. Kelyačky; and the Gospel in English, by the Very Rev. Archimandrite James Virvos, of the Greek Cathedral in London.

There were many communicants of different Orthodox nationalities. After the Lord's Prayer, which was said by everybody present, each in his own language, the Serbian Assistant Priest explained the meaning of the words, "Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις"—"The holy things to those who are holy"—and asked to approach to the Holy Communion only those who were "sanctified by orthodoxy of belief, and purified by repentance and confession." Some of the communicants had made their individual confession in their own national Churches beforehand; some joined in the "general confession" in the church at that moment; they received absolution, and were "reconciled and reunited to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" (the words of the ritual of absolution)—the Orthodox always consider their Communion as a "coming back to the Church" from which they have been separated by their sins.

The moment of Communion was the climax of the whole service, and of its spiritual purpose—the real unity of different Orthodox nationalities among themselves.

Another interesting moment was the ordination of an Ukrainian deacon performed by the Archbishop Athenagoras. Immediately after the consecration of the Holy Gifts, the candidate was led into the Sanctuary and round the Holy Table with the other clergy, while the choir was singing the following beautiful hymns:

"O holy Martyrs, who have fought the good fight, and received your crowns; entreat ye the Lord, that our souls may be saved."

"Glory to Thee, O Christ God, the Apostles' boast, the Martyrs' joy, whose preaching was the Consubstantial Trinity."

"Dance, O Isaiah! The Virgin has been with child, and has born a Son, Emmanuel, both God and man: Orient is His name: whom magnifying, we call the Virgin blessed."

Then the Archbishop laid his hands upon the head of the ordinand, and read the prayer, the choir meanwhile slowly and constantly repeating, "Kyrie eleison." Then the Archbishop proclaimed him ordained deacon "by the Divine Grace of the All-Holy Spirit, through the laying on of hands," and vested him in deacon's robes, saying "Axios" ("He is worthy"): and the congregation spontaneously replied: "Axios."

At the end of the service, the Bishop of London, Dr. Wand, who had been standing all the time in cope and mitre, was led to the pulpit and preached the sermon.

For the first time an Anglican Bishop preached at such a service. It was a wonderful experience: East and West meeting together in the "essentials of Faith" under the blessing of Orthodox Unity—of those "spiritual gifts," which, to Dr. Wand's mind, were being given to the West by the East.

After the Liturgy the Serbian Church, in the name of the Orthodox Priests' Association, asked everybody to join in the "Agape"—a common brotherly meal, according to the ancient Christian custom, which has survived in Serbia to the present day on "Slava" and "Sobor" occasions, when people come to the church for the whole day, and remain round it eating together, singing, and dancing their folk-dances, in the churchyard.

The Serbian Orthodox Youth Movement, together with the other Orthodox Youth Movements linked together in "Syndesmos," prepared a joint programme to which the various Orthodox nationalities contributed.

The Church Hall was full of people, sitting and standing. After the Lord's Prayer, sung by the Serbian Youth Choir, the Secretary of the Serbian Orthodox Youth Movement, Mr. D. Petrovich, said a few words of welcome; then the Chairman, Mr. H. Midgley, explained the word "Syndesmos," and the real meaning of that service of "link" between the different national Orthodox Youth Movements. Then the Rumanian priest, Fr. Galdâu, spoke on the task of Orthodox Youth to-day, concluding that only through unity in Faith and mutual help can Orthodox Youth withstand the temptations of the terrible uncertainty of the present world.

"The Association of Orthodox Priests," he said, "looks with sympathy and support on this effort for Pan-Orthodox Unity, so strongly manifested in to-day's magnificent service."

The folk-songs and dances performed by all Orthodox nationalities were like a beautiful bunch of flowers, with their different colours and scents, yet one in harmony and spirit.

Great credit is due to Fr. Nikolich, who initiated and prepared the service in his church.

Sermon Preached by the Lord Bishop of London

"We took sweet counsel together, and walked in the house of God as friends." Psalm lv. 15 (Prayer Book version).

It is very good of you to give some of your English friends the oppor-

tunity of joining with you in this lovely service this morning. We understand that this great united service is intended to give you an opportunity of thanking Almighty God for the material gifts that you have received through our various refugee aid organizations, and particularly for the opportunity that you have of worshipping God according to your own rite in some of our English churches.

We, on our part, are very glad to have the chance of thanking Almighty God that He has given us the opportunity of helping you in this way. Most of us who are English people are used to being separated for prolonged periods from our homes and from our friends. In our farflung Commonwealth we travel a great deal, and reside sometimes in the far corners of the earth. So we understand what the separation means that you have to endure for so long a period. And we understand too, that in your case, only too often, this separation is not a voluntary one, but an enforced one; and we sympathize with you deeply in the conditions that separate you from your own native country and from your homes.

And we are very happy to give you the chance of worshipping Almighty God in separate churches according to your own rites. There are, at the present time, four of our own churches in the diocese of London that you are using for your worship—the Russians, the Poles, the Cypriots, and the Serbs: and occasionally the Rumanians worship in another of our churches. We are particularly happy that you should have this opportunity because we know that when you are in the presence of Almighty God, you realize more clearly than you can elsewhere the intimate unity that still subsists between yourselves and your own people in your own country. And we know that you realize that in Christ you are still one with all those whom you love, and though many miles may separate you, yet in Him you have a close fellowship and unity.

It is of course a very long time since we English people got to know intimately some of your Orthodox customs and rites. It was as long ago as 1599, when the Levant Company was founded, that the English chaplains travelling in the Eastern Mediterranean came in contact with various Orthodox Churches, and came to know and to love them. It was not very long after, owing to the widening friendship between us, that in 1627 there came to us from Constantinople that great and priceless gift of the *Codex Alexandrinus*, one of the most treasured manuscripts of the sacred Scriptures. And again not very long after, in 1677, one of my own predecessors as Bishop of London, Bishop Compton, had the great happiness to be able to arrange for a church to be established for the Greek people living in London.

After that, a number of students for the Ministry were brought from Greece to study in Oxford. That experiment did not prove a great success, mainly I think because the Greeks found it very difficult to accommodate themselves to our English customs and manners. Nevertheless, the friendship between us held fast, and after a period during which association between us, for one reason or another, was difficult, in the First World War we had the very great privilege in this country of training many of the Serbian students for the Ministry.

And now we reap the advantage of that ripening friendship, because we realize that here we of the English obedience have a unity with you which is of the strongest possible description: a far stronger unity, if you will allow me to say so, than statesmen of our various countries can even hope to establish. When the statesmen come together and try to influence people to join into some kind of mutual co-operation, they try to do it, so to speak, from the outside. They start with people who are entirely different, with their own ambitions and their own aims, their own tastes and their own desires, and they try to wean them out of their isolation and bring them together by hook or by crook. But we, in the Faith of Christ, start from exactly the opposite point. Because we are baptized into Christ, we are members of His Body; and being members of His Body, we are already one with each other. We have been, each one, adopted into the family of Christ; and that is based on a securer foundation than any political organization can ever be.

It is in our unity with Him that there lies the greatest hope of ultimate unity for the world as a whole. And in this unity, we in this country have learnt a great deal already from you. For all of us the essentials of the Faith are the same. That may be a bold thing to say, and some might dispute it; but at any rate, that is my view. The essentials of the Faith are the same: but we emphasize different elements of the Faith, each in our own characteristic way. Here, in what we call the West, it has been our custom to emphasize the Cross and the Death of Christ. We have thought a great deal of the great sovereignty of God, and the way in which that sovereignty has been denied by the sin and wickedness of man. And we have thought of the Cross of Christ as breaking down the barriers of sin, reconciling man once again to the sovereignty of God, and producing in man a moral character which will fit him for his eternal home in Heaven.

But all this, true as it is, has been on the external side, if I might use the expression, of human character. But in the churches of the Orthodox obedience you, while holding that undoubtedly, have nevertheless been accustomed to emphasize a different aspect of our common Christianity. You—at least, so it seems to me—have started more characteristically from Bethlehem, the Nativity of Christ, and the doctrine of the Incarnation. You have followed in the steps of the great Apostle St. John, and you have thought of the eternal Word of God coming out of Heaven, taking to Himself human nature, and making that part and parcel of His own being. And you have thought of that being reproduced, in a sense in the case of every individual Christian. When we make our Communions, as some of your faithful have done this morning, we receive the Body and Blood of Christ: His personality enters into our own, and forms the nucleus of a new personality within us, and grows up in us and makes us new creatures, until we may grow to His perfection, to the fullness of the measure of the stature of Christ.

You, I would suggest, have thought about your religion acting internally in the human personality, producing this new creature, whereas we have more habitually thought of the soul that is saved, being plucked as a brand

from the burning, by a force which comes to him from outside. But I believe that we in the West have badly needed that aspect of theological thought which, it seems to me, has been characteristic of your own great Divines dating from the early Greek Fathers. Many of us have in these days been accustomed to study the great Fathers of your Church, and we have learnt and are still learning a great deal from them. Consequently, my friends, I would say that, if we have been privileged to help you with our material gifts, you are quite definitely helping us with your spiritual gifts. I pray to God that this unity may long subsist and grow. We take sweet counsel together, and we walk in the House of God as friends. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Amen.

THE SERBIAN CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN

by THE VERY REV. PROTOPRIEST M. NIKOLICH

I

THE life of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Great Britain begins in 1942. Then at the request from the Royal Yugoslav Government the Serbian Orthodox Bishop for the United States and Canada sent to London two priests from the United States. A Serbian Orthodox Chapel was established in the house of the Russian Prince Vsevolod Romanov, at 12 Lennox Gardens, S.W. 1. There were but few Serbs in London then: the members of the Government and the Diplomatic Corps, a few officials and a few members of the old Serbian colony.

Towards the end of 1944 a priest who had escaped from a German Concentration Camp arrived in London and became the Rector of the Serbian Orthodox Church in London, while both the priests who had been carrying out the duties of the rector before left for the United States. At the end of 1946 the house of Prince Vsevolod had to be vacated. The financial situation was worse than desperate. There was a real danger that Divine Services could no longer be celebrated. It was then that the Royal Yugoslav Family came to the rescue. It was they who made it possible for a house to be purchased at 12 Egerton Gardens, S.W. 3, where a Chapel was reopened and a centre for all Serbian refugees established.

Towards the end of 1947 the British Government announced that Displaced Persons would be given employment in Great Britain as European Voluntary Workers. So in 1947 and '48 there was a great influx of Serbs who, remaining loyal to their principles of freedom and democracy, had refused to return to the Communist-ruled Yugoslavia. They were for the greater part those who had been taken prisoner by the Germans or those who had been able to escape from the country into Italy and from there to be transferred to Germany after the war. Thousands of Serbs found employment in England, Scotland and Wales.

Together with the workers a few priests arrived in this country under the same conditions. The British Ministry of Labour was approached, and the priests were given permission to leave their employment and devote their services to the organizing of the matters of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Great Britain. The British Council of Churches rendered

invaluable help and service to all Refugee Churches by paying full salaries and travelling expenses of the priests in the beginning, and keeping up this assistance, although in much reduced terms, right up to the middle of 1953.

As the Serbs live in small and scattered groups, the priests have to face many problems and often are obliged to travel for hours taking their services to every member of their flock. Apart from the Rector in London there were six more priests in charge of parish duties, and later a new priest was ordained.

In the Chapel in London services were regularly celebrated. On occasions of feast days such as Christmas, Easter and Whitsun many Serbs would pour into London in order to take part in the Divine Service, and our small Chapel proved insufficient for these large numbers. Once again the Church of England came to the rescue and put its Churches at our disposal. This was also the case in many towns in the provinces. On occasions great Church meetings were organized, and the Serbs had an opportunity to come into touch with each other, hear the Serbian word spoken, and feel that they belong to a larger community. Normally in the afternoon on days of such Church meetings there would be a social gathering with programmes of music, songs, national dances and recitation where young people take part in entertaining the older generation. In days of inescapable gloom, when nostalgia for home, and for dear ones left at home, has us all in its grip, this type of entertainment is salutary, in fact essential, spiritual food. Of these Church Meetings there was one which immediately leaps to mind—the Bristol Church Meeting where more than three thousand Serbs met.

This growth of the Serbian colony in Great Britain and especially in London made it imperative for the London Parish to find a church big enough to accommodate all its parishioners.

The London Rector had immediately started to look for English churches which were not in use. Thanks to the understanding of His Lordship Bishop Wand and his representative, Archdeacon Hodgins, the Serbian Orthodox Church acquired the Church of St. Colomb in Lancaster Road. With the permission of the London Diocese it was possible to rearrange this church and adapt it to the needs of a Serbian Orthodox Church.

As soon as it was known that the Diocese of London had given its permission there was an appeal sent to all the Serbs in the United Kingdom. Although it can be said that every one of the Serbs here has family dependents at home whom he feels bound in honour and love to support to the best of his ability by sending parcels of food and clothes from here, there can hardly be found a Serb who did not help to raise the necessary sum of money.

Nor did our British friends forget to help once again. Private individuals and public organizations all sent in their donations. The *Church Times* came to our assistance by publishing several articles on the work of establishing a new Orthodox Church in London. We found a staunch supporter in the General Secretary of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations.

Among the organizations which sent us donations we can here mention but a few, such as the Society of the Faith, the Yugoslav Relief Society both in London and in Glasgow, the Yugoslav Society in Great Britain, the Harold Buxton Trust, and many others. From the United States the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church sent their gift. When we think of the individual members of the British public, our hearts instantly warm to the thought of our old and outstanding friend, Lady Paget, who has for so long been associated with the Serbs and their cause.

And finally, on the great national day of the feast of St. Vitus, Vidovdan, on June 28th, 1952, the great celebration of the consecration of the new Church began in London. The celebrations were continued the following day, and indeed it was one of the most beautiful manifestations of the religious life of the Serbs in the United Kingdom. And the Anglican Church of St. Colomb became the first Serbian Orthodox Church in London, dedicated to the first Archbishop of Serbia, Serbia's great teacher and the founder of the Autonomous Serbian Church.

At the beginning of 1953, apart from the already existing parish in London, four more parishes were established in the provinces. Each of these parishes numbers about a thousand parishioners and has its Parish Council which takes care of all matters pertaining to the secular administration of the Parish, such as the salaries of the parish priests, etc. The sources of income of the parishes are the sale of candles, the collections during the Services and a certain contribution asked of each member, which members, we regret to say, are not over-accurate in sending in.

Apart from their Church in London the Serbs have been able to buy a Church in Halifax. Next to this Church they have a large hall which serves as the meeting-place and therefore as a spiritual centre for the Serbs of Halifax, Leeds, Bradford and the whole of that neighbourhood. There are also in existence Serbian Orthodox Chapels such as those in Bicester with 250 parishioners, Bromley, near Basingstoke, with about 125 parishioners, Shalstone with 150, and Donnington with about 125 parishioners. While in other places, such as Didcot, the Serbs share chapels with members of other nations belonging to the Orthodox Faith. In fact the position in short is the following:—there are 6,500 Serbs in the United Kingdom, they are divided into five parishes and are looked after by seven priests.

The picture of the life of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the United Kingdom cannot be complete without a few words about our relations with our Sister Church of England. From what has been said earlier it is obvious that the Serbian Orthodox Church is greatly indebted to the kindness and understanding of the Church of England. Here we must not leave unmentioned that during the year 1947, just as during the 1914 World War, a whole group of our young theological students were received in England and given theological education at Dorchester College, near Abingdon, Berks. Later this group was followed by yet another one.

Apart from this invaluable material help that our Sister Church has rendered us, we feel so very grateful for all the moral support that it has been giving us.

It shall not be forgotten that the Primate of England, the Archbishop of

Canterbury, has risen twice in defence of the suffering Serbian Church, oppressed under the godlessness of the Communist regime, and thus added to the spiritual strength of the Serbian Orthodox Church at home, encouraging it not to lose heart, and to carry on the struggle for true Christianity and its principles.

PROTOPRIEST M. NIKOLICH.

THE SERBIAN CHURCH AND THE RUSSIAN DIASPORA

THE sad picture of the divisions of the Russian Diaspora becomes less gloomy when the situation is viewed from the outside, through the eyes of the other Orthodox Churches, and in particular of the Serbian.

The Orthodox Church in Serbia finds itself at present in an unique position, sharply contrasted with that of all other Orthodox Churches, though the difference is purely external, and never becomes essential. Alone among Orthodox Churches to-day, it is in the sphere of influence of both East and West, but is on territory which is neither Eastern nor Western, being linked to the East by a Communist regime and an ideological struggle against religion, while a cold war against the Cominform puts it emphatically in the Western camp. Before the Second World War it witnessed the pronounced anti-Soviet bias of the Russian emigration centre and the Yugoslav government, and the profound influence thereon of Western ideas and Western culture. After the War it passed through a Communist revolution, and from 1944 to 1948 found itself within the Soviet orbit. It has therefore had a practical experience of both worlds, but at present belongs to neither. For this reason the opinion of the Serbian Church on those questions which occupy the minds of the Orthodox Russian émigrés must be of particular value and interest.

Our attention is first of all called to the *example* of the Serbian Church —to deeds and not to words. It is the only Orthodox Church which in the thousand years of its history has not had a single real schism. On its coat of arms stands a white Cross, with the letter S four times—"*Samo sloga srbina spassava*" ("Concord alone preserves the Serb"). If every Orthodox Church has brought its own particular gift to the treasure-house of Orthodoxy, the Serbian gift is undoubtedly that of the four "Ss"—"sobornost"—*unity in practice*. This consciousness of their oneness has so penetrated into the very flesh and blood of the Serbs as a people that they cannot imagine Orthodoxy in any other way, or their Church acting otherwise than as a body. Five centuries of Turkish domination have welded them into one whole like no other people. Their destiny led them such ways that at times they found themselves split up into as many as five jurisdictions.[1] But they always realized that this was only an external division, a thing "of this world," brought about through the force of necessity only. They never failed to distinguish between it and their inner spiritual life, being

[1] Before the First World War: (1) The Metropolitanate of Belgrad in Serbia; (2) The Metropolitanate of Karlovtzi, which assumed the name of "Serbian Patriarchate"; (3) The Metropolitanate of Montenegro, actually an Exarchate alternately of the Church of Constantinople and of the Russian Church; (4) The "Autocephalous Church of Dalmatia and the Bukovina" in the Austro-Hungarian Empire; and (5) The Serbian Church in South Serbia (Macedonia) under the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

always conscious of and developing their spiritual unity. They never indulged in "jurisdictional quarrels," though there was plenty of pretext for them,[2] and they remained in perpetual unbroken eucharistic communion with each other. They have remained faithful to this ideal right up to these difficult times. Despite the completeness of the analogy between their position and that of the Russian Church since 1917, they have had no schism. Certainly there were circumstances which made this easier: but it would be unjust not to allow the Serbs the credit due to them.

A pseudo-ecclesiastical element which began acting against the canonical hierarchy, trying under government pressure to separate off the whole Church of Macedonia, and which to this day enjoys the support of the government, none the less never actually went into open schism, despite the refusal of the Synod of Bishops to give its blessing to the "Union of People's Priests." And on the other hand, people who did not sympathize with the "loyalty" of the Patriarch Vincent towards the Communist government, and did not approve of his election, never dared to cut themselves off from him and from the Synod, of which all the Bishops were members, including those abroad. The hierarchs who remained abroad—Nicolas of Žiča, and Irenaeus of Dalmatia, as well as Dionysius of North America—though they have openly expressed their disapproval of the Communist regime (both in the Soviet form and in Tito's), nevertheless remained under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch and the Synod, and have not created any independent "Church in Exile." Thus has God seen fit to bring external circumstances to the support of internal national characteristics.

After the Russian Revolution of 1917, the Serbs considered the problem of the Russian Church from the same point of view. The Patriarch Barnabas carried on a friendly correspondence with the Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow, and the official Calendar of the Serbian Patriarchate, "Tsrkva" ("The Church") for 1936 published a photograph of the Metropolitan Sergius with his full title, and the words, "He who sorrows with the Church in Russia." At the same time the Serbian Church gave a generous welcome to the Metropolitan Antony and the Synod of Bishops in Exile, which became known among Russians abroad as the "Karlovtzi Synod," from the name of the residence of the Serbian Patriarch.[3] The Patriarch Barnabas did all he could to reconcile this Synod and the Moscow Patriarchate, and was greatly saddened by both parties when nothing was achieved. His basic idea had been that they should not judge or excommunicate one another, but remain in a communion of prayer.

In the same place, Sremski-Karlovtzi, in 1935 the Patriarch Barnabas called a Council of the heads of the four dioceses of the Russian Church in Exile—the Metropolitans Eulogius, Anastasius, Theophilus of North America, and Bishop Demetrius from Harbin, hoping to bring about their mutual reconciliation. The year before, he had invited the Metropolitan

[2] The Serbian "Patriarch" in Sremski-Karlovtzi had in fact no right to the title, which was not allowed him by the other hierarchs, who considered him as a Metropolitan.

[3] After the Peace of Versailles in 1919 and the creation of Yugoslavia, all the five former jurisdictions of the Serbian Church were reunited under one head, who took the title "Archbishop of Pech, Metropolitan of Belgrad and Karlovtzi, and Patriarch of Serbia."

Eulogius, who had come to see the Metropolitan Antony, to celebrate the Liturgy in the Russian Convent at Hopov,[4] which was under his jurisdiction, despite the sorrowful fact that Mgr. Eulogius had been refused the right to celebrate in the Russian Church in Belgrad, where he had come to make his peace. A year later, however, the ban on Mgr. Eulogius was removed by the Synod, on the insistence of the Patriarch Barnabas, who then celebrated the Holy Liturgy with Metropolitan Eulogius and other Russian and Serbian hierarchs in his Cathedral at Belgrad: so peace was restored. A year later again, the Patriarch Barnabas himself read the Prayer of Remission over the Metropolitan Antony, who had died while under the excommunication of the Moscow Patriarchate. On the fifteenth anniversary of his death, in 1951, the Serbian Bishop Macarius of Budimlyansk celebrated a Requiem over his grave in the Iverski Church in Belgrad, and prayed at the Great Entrance both for "the Most Holy Patriarch of Moscow and all the Russias, Alexis," and for "the late Blessed Metropolitan Antony."[5]

The late Bishop Irenaeus of Dalmatia, at the request of the Russian Metropolitan Nicolas of Krutitsk, ordained Hieromonk Basil Krivocheine for the Russian Church in Oxford under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate; and yet this same Bishop died in the arms of Fr. Nicolas Popov (of Manchester), of the "Russian Church in Exile," who was on most friendly terms with him, and came to give him the Last Sacraments. The Requiem before his funeral was celebrated at the Serbian Church in London, at the invitation of Fr. M. Nikolich, the Patriarch's Representative, by Bishop John (Shahovskoi) of San Francisco (of the Metropolitanate of America) who was passing through London, together with the Priest of the Russian Patriarchal Church in London, Fr. Antony Bloom, and the local Serbian Priest. The funeral service itself was performed by Bishop John with Bishop Matthew of the Polish Church (in exile), and sixteen Priests of different nationalities and jurisdictions. *Priests of all three Russian jurisdictions abroad were together in one Church.*

When Bishop Nicolas of Žiča came to London in the summer of 1952 for the consecration of the Serbian Church, he met with members of the Russian Patriarchal parish on the friendliest terms, and spoke warmly of the Moscow Patriarchate as the guardian of Orthodoxy in the U.S.S.R., whom no one should dare to judge from afar. Yet he performed the consecration of the Serbian Church together with priests of the Russian "Exile" jurisdiction. During the last Liturgy that he celebrated on that visit, he prayed at the Great Entrance for the Metropolitans Anastasius and Leontius, out of deference for Russians present whose sympathies were with the "Russian Church in Exile" and the American Metropolitanate.

[4] This community is now at Fourque in France. During the War the convent at Hopov was burnt down, and the Abbess and the nuns (who nearly all came from the Lesninsky Convent in Russia) were forced to move to Belgrad. After the War they were accepted into the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate, and promised the possibility of returning to Russia, to the Novodevitch Convent; but nothing came of this, and in 1950 they were evacuated to France, where they are now under the jurisdiction of the Russian Church in Exile.

[5] All the Russian Churches in Belgrad are at present under the Patriarchal jurisdiction, in spite of the complete political break between Yugoslavia and Moscow. It is dangerous even to speak of anything "Soviet"; but the Church—both Serbian and Russian—is above that.

At the great Serbian "Spiritual Council of Vidovdan" at Cheltenham on June 28th, 1953, Archbishop John (Maximovitch), head of the "Russian Church in Exile" in Western Europe, was present at the Liturgy on the invitation of the Serbian Patriarchal Representative, the Very Rev. Fr. M. Nikolich. At the request of the Serbian hierarchy, he ordained a deacon for the Serbian Church; and a week later, in the Russian Church in London, he ordained a priest, concelebrating with Russian, Serbian and Roumanian clergy. Both at the Serbian "Spiritual Council"—in the presence of an assembly a thousand strong—and at the Russian service in London, the Archbishop prayed for "the Most Holy Patriarch Vincent," thus underlining the correctness of the canonical position of the Serbian Church abroad. During the official dinner, in answer to the question of a Russian priest from America, "How can one be in communion with the Serbian Patriarch when there is no difference between his attitude to the Communists and that of the Patriarch of Moscow?" the Archbishop replied: "There is a great difference between them. The Serbs already have the sad example of the Russians before their eyes, and therefore neither at home nor abroad do they wish to destroy their unity."

Six weeks later, at Abingdon, those same Serbian priests who had celebrated with Archbishop John, together with the same Serbian choir, concelebrated with a Russian priest from Paris of the Patriarchal Jurisdiction, Fr. Basil Solnuishkin.

The Pan-Orthodox Liturgy celebrated at the Serbian Church in London on November 29th marked a climax of this Serbian "irenic" attitude.

What is this? A "diffuse catholicity," according to the expression of one extreme member of the "Russian Church in Exile"? Or "a lack of brotherly feeling towards the sister Church in Russia," as it appears to a no less passionate supporter of the Moscow Patriarchate?

I think that neither is right. There is both Catholicity and brotherly feeling. But there is also something else—a definite ideological outlook. Both the late Patriarch Barnabas and the present Patriarch Vincent have spoken of it to me, as well as Bishop Nicolas of Žiča.

This outlook can be defined as follows: there must be no schisms. In principle no one can break with the canonical authority without the sanction of the Synod, even when it seems necessary from a political point of view. A subjective political, or even ecclesio-political or theological opinion (unless it is an open heresy) cannot justify a schism. Such is the ideal of the Catholic Church. The Church and its Catholic structure stand above individuals, even above the First Hierarch, and therefore such mistakes as he may make *are personal ones and do not pertain to the whole Church.*[6] They cannot be allowed to undermine the catholicity of the Church. If for some reason this has already happened, great care must be taken not to deepen the wound.

Not every "schism" is one in the full sense of the word, and there must therefore be no hurry to sever whole Churches from the body of Orthodoxy.

[6] "Does the Patriarch Alexis receive Holy Communion when he celebrates the Liturgy?" Archbishop John was asked by the same priest from America. "Yes, I should suppose he does," the Archbishop replied, "The Holy Sacraments are not dependent on persons."

External circumstances, often of a non-ecclesiastical character, produce mutual misunderstandings and disagreements, and separation of jurisdictions. Even purely ecclesiastical "schisms" are not always true schisms. We need only remember the "Meletian Schism" in the Church of Antioch in the fourth century, the head of which, St. Meletius, presided over the Second Ecumenical Council, although the Church of Rome supported the "catholic hierarch of Antioch," Paulinus, the head of the opposing party: yet both were Orthodox.

It must not be forgotten that St. John Chrysostom died under the excommunication of a hierarchy which has come down in history as Catholic; and when under St. Proclus his name was restored to the diptychs, and his supporters returned to the Church and recognized the hierarchy, St. Cyril of Alexandria, a strict canonist, exclaimed, "And where is the place of Matthias if Judas be rehabilitated?" The Catholic hierarchy, in spite of its crime against Chrysostom, which St. Cyril could not recognize, remained nevertheless the bearer of the unity of the Church, fully within its historical succession. Yet the hierarch whom it excommunicated is a Saint.

The Church has a human aspect which must not be forgotten, and which (through human sinfulness) does not always coincide with its heavenly aspect—though this must not lead us to the opposite Liberal-Protestant view, which denies the visibility of the One, True, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. *This exists, but always remains ecumenical in character.* A local schism, on which *the whole Ecumenical Church* has not yet passed judgment, is not as yet "another faith." Its members continue to constitute a part, even if a diseased part, of the Church. Though every division involves a schismatic element which is to be condemned (even in the case of Chrysostom, not in his person, but in his foolish supporters), an act of excommunication does not necessarily involve the whole clergy and laity. Professor S. V. Troitsky has defined this as "the casting out of this or that hierarch from the unity of brotherly love," and calls it "a wise measure in the Primitive Church, which prevented quarrels among bishops from affecting priests and laity," adding "what a pity it is now forgotten!"[7] The cure of a diseased member of a body is effected by means of the slow healing of the wound, with the help of the other members, with the participation of each cell. So it was in 1945, when the Patriarch of Constantinople, under the influence of other local Churches, and in particular of the Russian Church, pronounced null, even over the dead, the Excommunication imposed seventy-five years before on the Bulgarian Church, "on all its bishops, clergy, and laity": it was to be as if the Act had never been. The "wise measure of the Primitive Church" appeared in this case to have been effective, even if "forgotten."

It is in such schismatic ailments, subsequently healed, that nearly all the present autocephalous Churches obtained their position.[8] In such cases a

[7] Cf. a letter to the Author, dated Belgrad, 27.1.52: "The 87th, 91st, 136th, 137th, and 147th Canons of the Council of Carthage show that an act of excommunication of a bishop does not involve his diocese, in which he retains all his rights."

[8] Notably in the case of the schism of the Greek Church (1820–50), which split away from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, not for reasons of nationality, like the Bulgarian Church, but simply for reasons of state.

brotherly spirit towards the sister Churches, means objective and unhypocritical conduct towards both contending parties in the particular local Church, and active participation in the work of reconciliation. When a *real* schism occurs—a separation from the *essence* of Orthodoxy, as in the case of the "Living Church," or the "Self-Consecrators"—the sister Churches, after a short hesitation, soon find the true way and condemn them. If such an answer is not forthcoming, it means that the wound is not mortal.

The active help of the Serbian Church to the Russian Church in overcoming her internal divisions, first tendered by the Patriarch Barnabas, continues to be given at the present time, and is now bearing happy fruit. Nearly all the other local Churches essentially share the view of the Serbian Church. Russian church-goers, at home and abroad, should pay due attention to the voice of the wise sister-Churches, and try to take their advice. In 1951, in Belgrad, just before leaving for the West, I spoke about this question to the Patriarch Vincent. His words were full of this wisdom: "The Patriarchate of Moscow is the true, canonical, Orthodox Church in Russia. We cannot do otherwise than recognize it, especially as we contributed to its restoration. Thus in Yugoslavia we have completely solved the problem of Russian divisions. Here the Russian Church is under the jurisdiction of its Patriarch.[9] But we do not interfere with its domestic affairs in other countries. Therefore we maintain relations with all the Russian Churches there, without attempting to decide on their quarrels. We believe that God is one, that Orthodoxy is one, and that the Russian Church is fundamentally also one, and that all differences will soon be settled."

The "Serbian Chrysostom," Bishop Nicolas, when in London last summer, expressed full agreement with his Patriarch, saying: "There is a complete spiritual unity: the same faith, the same dogma, and the Liturgy celebrated in exactly the same way, in Moscow, in Paris, and in America, in all the different jurisdictions. The Russians only lack a common canonical centre, which we, thank God, possess, and which Heaven forbid that we should lose." If it is difficult, owing to outside circumstances, for Russians abroad to find such a centre even among themselves, let them remember how in the last century the Serbs overcame this difficulty, when they had no such centre, and found, in spite of all obstacles, *a single spirit of love, in mutual Eucharistic communion of prayer*. This is always granted by God. One may disagree with certain public speeches or sayings—especially if they are of a political character—of individual hierarchs in Russia or abroad. But we cannot but feel that we are all *members of one Orthodox Church*, stronger than all the evils of this world, against which "the gates of hell shall not prevail." And the strength of the Church lies in unity—not necessarily jurisdictional unity, but a spiritual, eucharistic unity. That is the whole meaning of Orthodoxy.

It must be realized that all the Russian groups—that of the Patriarchate (both in Russia and abroad), and that in America, and that under Constantinople, and the "Russian Church in Exile"—*are the Church*; not separate Churches, but *all Orthodox, all the Russian Church*, in Eucharis-

[9] Formally only, as there is hardly any direct contact.

tic communion with other local Churches; and they are bringing to Christ millions of people in Russia, and thousands abroad. As Churches they all fulfil their tasks in this sinful and godless world. A schismatic spirit, feeding on suspicion, and finding expression in jurisdictional quarrels, is the only sign of unorthodoxy—and that only in very small groups in the various jurisdictions and parishes. We need only to free ourselves from this spirit, and *try to understand each other in love and concord*, so that the holy light of Orthodoxy may shine in us with full force.

" 'Master, we saw one casting out devils in Thy name: and we forbad him, because he followeth not us.' But Jesus said, 'Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us' " (Mark ix. 38–40).

The hour will come when History will prove it so here as well. At the moment, this may appear to us utopian. But concord and love are to be found in the soul of each one. These are the cells that will heal the wound. Let us become such cells, and humbly set forth on this way!

London, 14.12.53. VLADIMIR RODZIANKO.

LETTER FROM PATRIARCH ALEXEI TO THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH

(from the "Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate," No. 5, 1953)

A HOLY embrace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Your All-Holiness, Most Holy Lord, beloved brother in Christ and fellow-minister of Our Humility,

It was with affection that We acquainted ourselves with Your All-Holiness's communication of September 25th of last year on the question of making ready the Autocephalous Churches for the summoning of a preparatory Conference for a General Council.

While acknowledging together with Your All-Holiness in Your God-given wisdom that there is an acute need at the present time for the Holy Orthodox Church to discuss in Council a number of pressing questions of contemporary Church life, We think it our duty to remind Your All-Holiness of one of the basic factors which hinders such discussion in common by sister churches, namely the unfortunate existence of a number of as yet unsettled questions in the mutual relations between some individual Churches, including also our own two Churches—questions which arose in the past as a result of unilateral actions by the holy Ecumenical Patriarchs of blessed memory then reigning. We are thinking, for example, of the so-called "West European Orthodox Russian Exarchate" which continues to exist in the jurisdiction of the Most Holy Throne of Constantinople, called into existence by one of Your All-Holiness's predecessors, the late Most Holy Patriarch Photios II, by his decree of February 17th, 1931, which temporarily placed Russian Orthodox parishes in Western Europe "directly under the jurisdiction of the Most Holy Ecumenical Patriarchal Throne." Your All-Holiness without doubt agrees that this act of the Most Holy Patriarch of Constantinople Photios II, being an act contrary to the holy canons and the traditions of the Church, represented an open interference in the indisputable rights of an independent ecclesiastical admini-

stration of the Autocephalous Orthodox Russian Church. To Our grief, this schism, which seemed to be healed in August–September 1945 by the reunion of the "West European Orthodox Russian Exarchate" with its Mother, the Russian Church, was speedily again fomented by the Ecumenical Supreme Bishop, the Most Holy Patriarch Maximos V, who reaffirmed in a decree of March 6th, 1947, the immediate dependence of the "Exarchate" on the throne of Constantinople. Our two protests to the Most Holy Throne of Constantinople of May 26th and June 26th, 1947, over this illegal and unfriendly act remained without an answer.

A second uncanonical action of the Most Holy Throne of Constantinople has still greater force—the giving by the Most Holy Patriarch Meletios IV, in a decree of June 6th, 1923, of the rights of wide autonomy within the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to the Finnish diocese of the Russian Orthodox Church. This act was an unprecedented interference of one local Church in the ecclesiastical administrative sphere of another. In spite of Our repeated reminders to the predecessors of Your All-Holiness—to the Most Holy Patriarch Benjamin on October 28th and December 29th, 1945, to the Most Holy Patriarch Maximos V on March 2nd and April 8th, 1946—of the necessity of restoring canonical order as rapidly as possible in the administration of the Orthodox dioceses of Finland, up to this day We have not received a satisfactory answer from the Throne of Constantinople.

The unpleasant appearance of the above mentioned acts of the Most Holy Patriarchs of Constantinople Meletios IV and Photios II is accentuated by the fact that in both cases there had first been a violent tearing away of her members from a Mother Church, and of her ecclesiastical territory from a sister Autocephalous Church. In other words, the freedom given us by Christ our Saviour had been consciously abused, a freedom which is strictly safeguarded in the holy canons (III, 8).

The attitude of the Throne of Constantinople is also grievous to us in the case of a former daughter of the Russian Church—the Polish Orthodox Church with which the Most Holy Throne of Constantinople is not in communion, sufficient evidence of which is the message of Your All-Holiness of September 26th, 1951, which we received at the time.

We know also that the lawfully elected head of the Polish Orthodox Church, His Beatitude Makary, Metropolitan of Warsaw and All Poland, has still not received an answer from Your All-Holiness to his letter announcing his election.

We are convinced that Your All-Holiness, in Your abounding love, entirely shares Our opinion of the propriety of settling as swiftly as possible in the spirit of canonical integrity, all that is now clouding the mutual relations between local Churches, and that You will co-operate in this with Your authority; then without doubt, the idea of a Pan-Orthodox Conference can be realized.

We have also received the copy graciously enclosed to us by Your All-Holiness of the list of topics drawn up by the Inter-Orthodox Conference on Mount Athos in 1930. We warmly thank Your All-Holiness for Your continuous care for the welfare of the Holy Orthodox Church, and inform

You that We are setting up a special commission of bishops and professors of our Theological Academies to examine in detail the questions for a future preconciliar Conference, and to discuss thoroughly the above mentioned topics of the Inter-Orthodox Commission.

Already however a cursory glance at the topics of the Inter-Orthodox Commission has shown us that there are serious difficulties in the way of realizing the plan of a preparatory conference.

For instance, point 1 of the list calls on Local Churches to increase ways of securing closer mutual relations. But the question arises whether it would not be a necessary condition for the success of future attempts first to settle existing differences in the mutual relations of local Churches, of which We have spoken above.

Point 3 of the list calls on Local Churches to regulate and improve Orthodox Church life in America. But would not the ecclesiastical situation in America be already noticeably improved if some local Churches, among them also the Throne of Constantinople, had taken up a strictly canonical position in their relations with our oldest Church organization outside our country, the diocese of North America and the Aleutians, and had condemned the harmful schism, known to Your All-Holiness, of the so called "North American Metropolitanate" now headed by Metropolitan Leonty (Turkevich), and the American branch of the so called "Russian Orthodox Church Abroad" headed by Metropolitan Anastasy (Gribanovsky)? Metropolitan Leonty and the bishops of the "North American Metropolitanate" who agree with him, were by Our decision and that of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church of December 25th, 1947, handed over to the Judgment of an episcopal Sobor and were inhibited from exercising their sacerdotal office. The bishops and clergy of the "Russian Orthodox Church Abroad" lie under a similar ban. (Decision of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church of August 10th, 1945.) But even up to now the representatives in America of the Throne of Constantinople are in communion and in canonical relations with this illegal collection of clergy and laity.

It is sufficient to recall the participation, at the invitation of the Exarch of Your All-Holiness in America, the Most Holy Archbishop Michael, of representatives of the Russian schismatic church at the local Inter-Orthodox Conference called at the beginning of 1952, an identical invitation to which Our American Exarchate was obliged to refuse.

Point 4 of the list calls attention to the quest by local Churches for means to restore the monastic life of the Orthodox East to its former splendour. In reading this question we could not help thinking of the present position of Russian monks on Mount Athos, who for more than three decades have been cut off from communications with their mother Church, and have daily to endure every kind of privation and obstruction. Is it just that the Russian Orthodox Church, which has in her time made no small contribution to the growth and prosperity of Orthodox monasticism on the Holy Mountain, without distinction of nationality or Church allegiance, should now not be in a position to establish ordinary canonical relations with her monastic foundations on Athos, should not be able to replenish

with young monks the glorious ranks of Russian spiritual athletes in the compound of the Most Holy Virgin, and should no longer be able to draw on the great collection of spiritual treasures of Athos?

In 1947 and 1948 We called the attention of the representatives of local Churches to the abnormality of the present position of Russian monks on Mount Athos, but still the Russian inhabitants of Athos lack proper Church organization: would it not then be useful also, before discussing the question of Eastern monasticism, for the Most Holy Throne of Constantinople to settle the problem of Athos with the Russian Orthodox Church?

Point 6 of the list speaks of the defence of the Faith by local Churches against the proselytism of various religious groups hostile to Orthodoxy, among which are Roman Catholicism and Uniatism. It is indisputable, that the placing of this question before the Orthodox Church as a whole is most appropriate at the present time, but it is yet more indisputable that each local Orthodox Church is bound daily, by every means at her disposal, to defend her flock, to protect herself from the thrusts of militant Catholicism, and to support her sister autocephalous churches in this respect. In this connection the relations of local Churches to the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia is of particular importance. As is perhaps known to Your All-Holiness, a Sobor of Greek Catholic clergy and laity at Priashev on April 28th, 1950, passed a resolution to liquidate the Union of Uzhorod of 1649 and to return to the bosom of the Holy Orthodox Church of their fathers. Two very large dioceses of the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia—Priashev and Mihailov—contain the former Greek Catholic believers and many ex-Uniate priests. The difficult task of re-educating the former Uniate priests, whose souls are attracted to Orthodoxy, but who find it hard to free themselves from centuries of prejudices against the Orthodox Church implanted by Rome, and the complex problems of a general organization of the new dioceses on Orthodox principles are being carried out in the teeth of fierce hostile propaganda and open actions on the part of the Vatican, which is straining every nerve in the attempt to hinder the successful development of Orthodoxy. In estimating the present position of the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia one must not underestimate also the surrounding Catholic world, which without doubt is on all sides using the Vatican in a savage struggle with Orthodoxy.

Does it not then appear to be now the first duty of local Churches to support in every way their youngest sister—the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia? And indeed, on the lawful establishment by Us and the Sobor of bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church of Autocephaly for the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia, of which we informed the Most Holy and Blessed Heads of Churches in Our encyclical of December 18th, 1951, the Churches of Alexandria, Antioch, Georgia, Roumania, Bulgaria and other local Churches entered into communion and canonical relations with her. But at the same time We have not received the decision of Your All-Holiness on this most important and uncontroversial topic.

How useful for the process of preparing the ground for a Pre-conciliar Conference would be a firm support by the Most Holy Throne of Constantinople for one of the most topical problems of church life!

Point 11 proposes that local churches should examine the means of electing bishops and heads of local churches in a manner more in conformity with the holy canons. The problem, undoubtedly, is most important, and needs for its solution profound investigation and detailed discussion. It is well known, however, that until a general Church practice has been set up, the respective electoral customs of each local Church are valid. The legality of this practice is recognized beyond dispute by the other sister churches, which thus bear witness to the agreement of local churches on the fundamental principles of Church order and government, to the unity of Orthodoxy. Thus the answer of the head of any Autocephalous Church to the informatory Epistle of the head of another local Church, means at the same time both entering into communion and into canonical relations with him, and a confirmation of the legality of the said act of the ecclesiastical administration of the said Church. In this connection, We still do not know the grounds on which Your All-Holiness has up till now not entered into relations with the Head of the Albanian Orthodox Church, His Beatitude archbishop Paisy, the head of the Polish Orthodox Church, His Beatitude Metropolitan Makary, and the head of the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia, His Beatitude Metropolitan Elevfery, lawfully elected to such high posts in their respective churches.

Similarly, until other methods have been decreed for declaring branches of any given local church autocephalous units, or for recognizing a Church as autonomous (point 16 of the list of topics), the existing order has legal force, according to which an autocephalous Church is founded by the decision of the Sobor of bishops of the Mother Church, which alone has the right to pass a resolution either for the granting of autocephaly to a branch of their own church or for the granting of the right of autonomy. We have many examples of this. But, as we have had occasion to mention above, the Most Holy Throne of Constantinople, contrary to the holy canons and to the tradition of the Church still has not entered into canonical relations with the legally established autocephalies of the Polish Orthodox Church and of the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia, and still keeps back within her jurisdiction the so-called autonomous Finnish Orthodox Church.

These grievous points We bring with brotherly love to the attention of Your All-Holiness, remembering the constant care of Your Holiness in godly wisdom for the good of Christ's Holy Church, and in firm confidence in Your co-operation in all ways for the healing of these and other wounds which now darken the mutual relations of sister local Churches.

I think it my brotherly duty to inform Your All-Holiness that at the same time as Your message We received and are now studying a communication from His Beatitude Christopher, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria and All Africa, also dealing with questions of preparing and calling together a Preconciliar Conference, and mentioning his intention of writing also to Your All-Holiness on this subject.

Embracing Your most beloved All-Holiness in brotherly fashion and praying for Your Holiness the blessings of God, I remain with unchanging love to You in Christ and in complete devotion

Moscow, March 7th, 1953. ALEXEI, *Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.*

THE GREEK CHURCH IN ITALY IN THE MIDDLE AGES

THE hellenization of Southern Italy in the early Middle Ages presents the historian with difficult and complex problems, the more so, as this special and at first sight purely local question was to have important repercussions on the relations between the Eastern and the Western churches.

It will be recalled that in antiquity this region had been thoroughly hellenized, and came, in fact, to be described as Magna Græcia. However—and this is an almost unique example—after the Roman conquest Latin culture had become predominant there. But historians are far from agreeing on the extent of this "de-hellenization." For on the one hand, it seems to be confirmed by archæological evidence; on the other hand, the rapid and all but complete re-hellenization of the southern tip of Italy in the seventh century can hardly be explained otherwise than by admitting the existence of a Greek substratum in this region.[1]

This region was incorporated politically into the Byzantine Empire after the campaigns of Narses (A.D. 553). No doubt, this led to the arrival in the country of officials and their families from the East. But the change of political allegiance seems to have had no influence on the social structure, and the position was still the same at the time of Pope Gregory the Great (590–604).[2] What did greatly alter the ethnic and religious character of this region was the arrival of large numbers of emigrants from the East, victims of the Persian, and especially the Arab, invasions (seventh century). It should be noted that most of these emigrants did not belong to the Greek race. They were mostly Levantines and Egyptians. Nevertheless, in language and culture, they were Greeks; though, not being from Constantinople, they had their own liturgical traditions—thus, they used the liturgies of St. James (the Syro-Palestinian rite) and of St. Mark (the Græco-Egyptian rite)[3] instead of the liturgy ascribed to St. John Chrysostom (that of Constantinople). The influence of these new-comers on the culture of Southern Italy was all the more widespread, as the Germanic invasions had caused a break in the continuity of the cultural and artistic traditions of Rome in this region.

The religious policy of the Iconoclast Emperors launched in 725/6 by Leo III the Isaurian was very unpopular in Italy. This, however, did not impede the progress of hellenization; on the contrary: since the Iconoclast decrees were apparently applied with less rigour in the more remote provinces of the Empire, and particularly in Italy, a new influx of emigrants, this time from Greece and Constantinople, came to Southern Italy.

Until then Southern Italy and Sicily formed part of the Western patri-

[1] On this question, see the communication of P. Francesco Russo to the Byzantine Congress at Salonika, "*Relazioni culturali tra la Calabria e l'Oriente bizantino nel Medioevo*," Bollettino della Badia Greca de Grottaferrata, nuova serie, Vol. VII, 1953, pp. 43–64.

[2] At this period the country we now call Calabria was still known by its ancient Latin name of Bruttium. The name of Calabria was then used for the Terra d'Otranto. The change of name must have taken place during the seventh century, being connected with the hellenization of the region, see Ch. Diehl, *Études sur l'administration byzantine dans l'Exarchat de Ravenne*, Paris, 1888, p. 33.

[3] On these Liturgies, see G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 163 et seq. On their employment by oriental refugees, see the communication of P. Russo mentioned above.

archate, in fact, of the metropolitan province of Rome.[4] The arrival of emigrants from the East did not alter the principles governing the ecclesiastical organization in these regions. There was, indeed, no reason why it should cause any difficulty with Rome, since even the pontifical throne was often occupied by Popes of eastern origin. Politically, Rome, as indeed in theory the whole of Italy, was part of the Empire; in practice, however, Byzantine domination was only effective in the southern part of the peninsula and in Sicily, which two regions had formed since the early eighth century a separate theme.[5]

The transfer of Eastern Illyricum, Southern Italy and Sicily to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Constantinople is frequently related by historians to the Iconoclast crisis: the Emperor Leo III is supposed to have effected this transfer as a means of retaliation against the Papacy which refused to countenance his doctrinal innovations. This view arises from two misconceptions: (a) a forced interpretation of the "*Chronography*" of Theophanes, whose chronology is sometimes uncertain and whose historical objectivity is open to doubt[6]; (b) acceptance at its face value of the testimony of the letters of Popes Hadrian I (771–795) and Nicholas I (858–867). It is true that some passages in the letters of these Popes give the impression that there was a casual relationship between the decrees against the images on the one hand and the confiscation of papal domains and the withdrawal of imperial territories from the jurisdiction of the Roman see on the other.[7] But this confusion was, undoubtedly, fostered deliberately by these Popes: they had at their disposal the archives of their chancellery in Rome, which archives—as we can see from the perusal of the *Liber Pontificalis*—certainly do not bear out the commonly accepted version. In writing to the Emperors, the Popes would have been betraying their own interest if they had mentioned the true cause of this change of jurisdiction—i.e. the enfeoffment of the Papacy to the Frankish monarchy. As these changes had taken place in the Iconoclast period, and since Rome had always been opposed to this heresy, the commonly accepted version seemed plausible enough. But in fact the transfer of Southern Italy, Sicily and Illyricum to the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople probably took place only after Rome had finally entered into the political orbit of the Franks, and after the Byzantines had lost all hope that the situation would soon be reversed in their favour: that is to say, during the reign of Constantine V, Copronymus, under the pontificate of Stephen II (*c.* 756); it seemed indeed unthinkable to the Byzantines that any prelate,

[4] A sketchy metropolitan organization had existed in Sicily since the time of Pope St. Gregory the Great. See Fliche et Martin, *Histoire de l'Église*, t. 5, pp. 42–3.

[5] In the Byzantine East, a military province was called a Theme. On the administration of Byzantine Italy, vide *C. Porfirogenito*, "*De Thematibus*," Introduzione, Testo critico, Commento a cura di A. Pertusi, Studi e Testi 160; Citta del Vaticano, 1952; *Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, "*De administrando imperio*," Greek text ed. Gy. Morovscik, English translation by R. H. J. Jenkins, Budapest, 1949, Chap. 50, p. 236.

[6] *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. de Boor, 1883, Vol. I, pp. 404, 408–10, 413. As to what credit we should accord to Theophanes on this point, see the excellent summing up by Père V. Grumel, *L'annexion de l'Illyricum oriental, de la Sicile et de la Calabre au patriarcat de Constantinople*, in *Mélanges J. Lebreton*, Paris, 1952, pp. 191–200.

[7] See for example the letter of Pope Hadrian to Constantine and Irene (Mansi, Amplissima Coll. Conc., XII, p. 1073), and the letter of Pope Nicolas to the Emperor Michael in A.D. 860 (ibid., XV, p. 167).

subject to the Emperor, should be dependent on an ecclesiastical superior who was under the official protection of a barbarian dynast. This is clearly attested in an observation made by the Armenian monk Basil in his *Notitia episcopatuum* (? beginning of ninth century). Writing of the sees of Thessalonica, Syracuse, Corinth, Reggio, Nicopolis, Athens, Patras and Neopatras, he remarks, "These churches have been united to the Synod of Constantinople, since the Pope of the Old Rome is under the domination of the barbarians."[8] According to the same author, Seleucia in Isauria was transferred for a similar reason from the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Antioch to that of Constantinople. The same argument was later used to uphold the claims of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to jurisdiction over Sicily and Southern Italy, by a Greek monk, Nilus Doxapatris, who composed in Palermo in 1143, at the invitation of King Roger II of Sicily, a "Taxis" of patriarchal thrones.[9] We have touched on the problem of jurisdictional changes which came about in the middle period of the eighth century, only in so far as it relates to the question which concerns us primarily here, that is, the question of the ecclesiastical organization of Southern Italy. It must be noted, however, that the problem is a complicated one, not only from the standpoint of chronology, but also from that of geography: we do not know for certain which territories were affected by this measure. For example, it is difficult to establish whether the measure applied to the whole of Western Illyricum, or—more particularly—to what was left of it after the Avaro-Slavonic invasions.[10] With regard to Southern Italy and Sicily, their integration into the patriarchate of Constantinople was, no doubt, facilitated by the hellenization of these two regions.

At the Seventh Ecumenical Council (A.D. 787) Southern Italy and Sicily were represented by Greek bishops, and they signed the Acts of the Council in their capacity of suffragans of Constantinople. We have already mentioned that Southern Italy and Sicily were formerly part of the metropolitan province of Rome. After their transfer to the jurisdiction of Constantinople, a metropolitan organization was not, so far as we know, immediately set up. At the same time, the annexed dioceses were not immediately integrated into the "Taxis" of Byzantine metropolitan sees.[11] Byzantine domination remained precarious until the reign of Basil I (867–886). The Lombard occupation had disrupted the ecclesiastical organization of Apulia; before the Lombard invasion this country had fourteen bishoprics; by the beginning of the ninth century there were only two dioceses (Lucera and Canosa), of whose existence we can be sure, although it is probable that there may have been two more (Trani and Bari). The disorganization was rendered more complete by the Saracens who occupied the country from 840 to 870. In the case of Sicily, which for a long time was ruled by the Moslems (Syracuse fell in 878 and Taormina in 902), the Byzantine ecclesiastical organization suffered a

[8] G. Parthey, *Notitiæ episcopales*, Berlin, 1866, pp. 74–5.

[9] Migne P.G. CXXXII, 1100D & 1104C.

[10] See E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, t. II, Paris, 1949, p. 677; also S. Vailhé, *L'Annexion de l'Illyricum au patriarcat œcuménique*, Échos d'Orient, XIV, 1911, pp. 23–36.

[11] See V. Laurent, *L'érection de la Métropole d'Athènes et le statut ecclésiastique de l'Illyricum au viiie siècle*, Revue des Études byzantines, t. I, 1943, pp. 58–72.

terrible blow; it was only the Norman conquest which put an end to the domination of the country by the infidels (1060–1072). However, in spite of some isolated cases of martyrdom, such as that of the monk Argentios in Palermo in 906,[12] there was no systematic persecution of the Christians under the Moslem occupation. But we note that there was in the tenth century a migration of Greek monks from Sicily to Calabria.

The reign of Basil I the Macedonian witnessed a recovery of Byzantine influence in Southern Italy.[13] Thus, in 876, the inhabitants of Bari appealed to Basil I for help against the Saracens, and the armies of the Emperor occupied the city, which became the residence of the Strategos commanding the theme of "Longobardia."[14]

The ecclesiastical organization of Greek-dominated Southern Italy at the end of the ninth century is well known to us from a *notitia episcopatuum* which has come down from that period.[15] (1) Firstly, there was Sicily, whose ecclesiastical capital was Syracuse, and which occupied the thirteenth place among the metropolitan sees dependent on "the apostolic and patriarchal throne of the Imperial and God-protected city of Constantinople"—being placed after Amasea and before Tyana; Syracuse had thirteen suffragans, and the whole of Sicily was dependent on this see, with the exception of Catania which was a metropolitan see without a suffragan. According to Nilus Doxapatris, Catania owed this distinction to her bishop, St. Leo, the opponent of the Iconoclasts (eighth century).[16]

(2) Next we have Reggio which occupied the thirty-fourth place and had twelve suffragans; first, seven dioceses which existed before the attachment to Constantinople, viz., Vibona, Tauriana, Locris, Squillace, Cotrone (formerly Croton), Nicotera and Tropaion; then, three more which were founded at the end of the ninth century—Rossano, Amantea, Neocastron—these dioceses must have been founded after the victorious campaigns of the Strategos Nicephorus Phocas (*c.* 885)[17]; finally, the bishoprics of Cosenza (= Κωνσταντία) and Bisignano, which in 743 undoubtedly formed part of the Roman patriarchate[18]; the Moslem invasions must have caused a serious upheaval, and the two sees, no doubt, remained vacant for some time; then, when the Byzantines re-established their domination over this region, they were attached as suffragans to the metropolitan see of Reggio although it is by no means certain that they lost their Latin character.[19]

It should be noted that eventually a thirteenth suffragan bishopric, that of Cassano, was created—probably in the tenth century.

(3) Then comes the province of Santa Severina which has the forty-eighth

[12] See Lynn Townsend White, *Latin Monasticism in Norman Sicily*, Cambridge, Mass., 1938, p. 27 et seq.
[13] See R. Guilland, *Les Patrices stratèges byzantins en Italie meridionale de l'avénement de Basile Ier à la mort de Léon VI (867–912)*, Actes du Congrès byzantin de Palerme (Rome, 1953), Vol. I, pp. 377–86.
[14] See Jules Gay, *L'Italie meridionale et l'Empire byzantin*, Paris, 1904, p. 103 et seq.
[15] See Heinrich Geltzer, *Texte der Notitiæ Episcopatuum*, München, 1901, pp. 550–9.
[16] Migne P.G., CXXXII, 1103B.
[17] J. Gay, op. cit., p. 132 et seq.
[18] Mansi, XIII, 367.
[19] J. Gay, op. cit., pp. 188–92.

place in this same *notitia*. This metropolitan see must have been created when Santa Severina returned into the fold of the Byzantine Empire, as a result of the above-mentioned campaign of the Strategos Nicephorus Phocas. Santa Severina had four suffragans: Umbriatico (Εὐρυάτα), Cerenzia, Aeisylon and Gallipoli, although this latter see was in Terra d'Otranto (Ancient Calabria). Later, a fifth bishopric, that of Palaeocastro, makes its appearance.

Besides these two metropolitan provinces there appears in Ancient Calabria the autocephalous archbishopric of Otranto (Ὑδροῦς).[20] At the time to which the above *notitia* belongs—that of Leo the Wise—the promotion of this see to an archbishopric must have been a very recent event, as in 880 the holder of the see was still only a bishop.

Such was the organization of the Byzantine church in Southern Italy at the end of the ninth century. The dioceses which we have listed correspond, with only a few exceptions, to the hellenized regions of the country; there were some regions in the south of the peninsula which belonged entirely to the Latin rite; and in any case, even at its height, the hellenization was limited to the extreme south, and in the West did not penetrate as far as the principality of Salerno, nor in the East as far as Bari. Indeed this latter city, although it was the chief city of the Theme of Longobardia, continued to be the seat of a Latin bishop who was under the authority of the Roman patriarchate. It is true that during the first half of the tenth century the relations between Byzantium and the Papacy remained on the whole good. There were no definite attempts by the Popes to put a stop to the religious expansion of the patriarchate of Constantinople in Italy.[21] Rome at that time seemed much more desirous of consolidating her position in ancient Illyricum and of eliminating Byzantine influence from it, as she was hoping to attract into her orbit the Slavonic peoples who had established themselves in that area.

Furthermore, the rapid collapse of the Carolingian Empire, and the recovery of Byzantium under the Macedonian dynasty (867–1056) favoured the position of the latter in Italy, and Byzantine influence expanded as far as Rome itself; thus, Alberic II, who held the title of "glorious prince and senator of the Romans," figured in the official list of allies of the Basileus, whereas his son, Pope John XII, revived at the beginning of his papacy in 955, the custom, abandoned since 781, whereby the Roman chancellery dated its documents with reference to the years of accession of the Emperors in Constantinople. However, in 962 Pope John XII was, much against his will, obliged to crown Otto I of Germany as Emperor: and this event changed the whole situation. Not only Rome, where the German sovereign tried to impose the principles of Caesaropapism, was lost to Byzantine influence,

[20] In Byzantine terminology, the adjective "Autocephalous" was used for two categories of archiepiscopal sees: (a) those which were in the full sense independent of any other—this is the sense in which the term is still used in our days in Orthodox Canon Law; (b) the term was also used for Archbishoprics exempt from any metropolitan jurisdiction, and directly dependent on a Patriarchate. In contrast with what has come about in the West, Eastern Canon Law distinguishes clearly between the two titles of Archbishop and Metropolitan.

[21] For the reasons for this non-intervention, see G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate*, London, 1947, pp. 112–13, whose remarks we find much to the point.

but a serious threat to the Byzantine power arose also in Southern Italy, to which Otto was trying to establish a claim. In the *Privilegium* bestowed (February 13th, 962) by the German Emperor on the Pope, there is a direct allusion to "Patrimonium Cala briae superioris et inferioris." [22] From that time the religious policy of Byzantium in Southern Italy followed a new direction. Until the reign of the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas (963–969) there was no attempt to extend the domain of the Greek rite into Apulia, but now, in view of Otto's claims to this region, the Basileus decided, with the assistance of Patriarch Polyeuctus (956–970), to introduce the Greek rite there. Liudprand of Cremona asserts that Greek took the place of Latin everywhere in the religious services in Apulia.[23] It is doubtful that a measure at once so radical in character and so difficult to carry out was, in fact, adopted. And yet Liudprand gives us another piece of information which deserves credence: he speaks of the transformation of the autocephalous archbishopric of Otranto into a metropolitan see with five suffragan bishops, whose dioceses were situated on the borders of Lucania and Apulia: Acerenza, Tursi, Gravina, Matera and Tricarico. The bishop of Cremona accompanies this information by a remark that these dioceses "evidently belong to the jurisdiction of our apostolic Pope." [24] The creation of this metropolitan see no doubt took place a short time after the break in 968 between Nicephorus and Otto. A *notitia* compiled at the time of Jean Tzimisces (969–976) confirms the existence of this metropolitan province and assigns it the fifty-fourth place.[25] Its creation evidently was an intrusion into a region which had formerly always been entirely Latin, but we must not forget that there had been no bishops, Latin or Greek, till now in Tursi, Tricarico or Gravina, and also that this region had been subject to the influence of Greek monks who came to Southern Italy in increasing numbers when Sicily fell under the domination of the Moslems.

But this time Rome did not show herself as indifferent as before to these new attempts at hellenization. By way of counter-measures the Popes and the "Romano-Germanic Empire" created metropolitan Latin provinces in the south of the peninsula. In May, 969, Pope John XIII decided to establish a metropolitan see in Benevento with ten suffragans, and later Pope Benedict VII created a metropolitan see in Salerno (*c.* 983). Naples and Amalfi also were raised to the status of archbishoprics. Now parts of the ecclesiastical provinces of Benevento and Salerno were territories under the political control of Byzantium; furthermore, two of the suffragan bishops attributed to Salerno, those of Cosenza and of Bisignano, were mentioned in the Byzantine episcopal lists as dependent on the Greek metropolitan see of Reggio,[26] while a new, purely Latin, diocese was established by a Papal bull in Malvito (to the west of Bisignano); of the six bishoprics attached to Salerno, two only—those of Nola and Poestum—were situated in a region purely Latin in character. J. Gay observes in this connection: "It seems

[22] See Th. Sickel, *Das Privilegium Ottos I für die Römische Kirche*, Innsbrück, 1883.
[23] See F. A. Wright, *The Works of Liudprand of Cremona* (Leg. 62), p. 273.
[24] Ibid., p. 273.
[25] See Gelzer, op. cit., pp. 569–72, and Grümel, *Regestes des actes du Patriarcat byzantin*, No. 792, p. 226.
[26] Cf. supra.

B E L G I U M S A F

that by establishing the ecclesiastical province of Salerno the Popes were seeking for the first time to bar the way to the Greek clergy; this was the first counter-offensive of the Roman and Latin patriarchate in a region which till then had apparently been left defenceless before the ever growing influence of the Byzantine church." [27] However, the Greeks were not put out of countenance by this new attitude of Rome, and pursued a skilful religious policy: instead of trying to impose the Eastern rite on purely Latin regions, such as northern Apulia, they made efforts to court the political loyalty of Latin bishops and to strengthen it by conferring Byzantine honorific titles and ecclesiastical distinctions on them, without forcing them to break with the Roman patriarchate; thus, the bishop of Lucera who did not accept the subjection of his see to the metropolitan province of Benevento, which was decreed by Pope Gregory V in 998, assumed, with the agreement of the Byzantine authorities, the title of Archbishop; and some time later there appears also in Siponto an archbishop independent of the see of Benevento; the same happened in Trani, whose Archbishop John—the recipient of the famous letter from Leo of Ochrida criticizing certain Latin usages—was granted the title of Syncellus which gave him a rank in the Greek ecclesiastical hierarchy. Needless to say, the Curia in no way recognized all these Eastern titles.

During the reign of Basil II, the Bulgar-slayer (976–1025), the Byzantine influence in Italy reached its zenith; the central power was represented by an able man, the Catapan Basil Bojoannés. Was the Latin metropolitan see of Bari established at this time? This would appear doubtful, in view of the failure of the negotiations in 1024 between the Emperor Basil II and the Patriarch Eustathius on the one hand and Pope John XIX on the other. The document on which this dating is based is certainly a forgery, and the creation of this metropolitan see would seem to have taken place later.[28]

The Byzantine influence in Italy suffered a decline after the Catapan Basil Bojoannes fell from favour (in 1028). The situation was further complicated by the arrival of the Norman adventurers on the scene. They had already fought against the Byzantines in Apulia, but had been completely routed in October, 1018, in a battle near Cannae. Taking advantage of the decline of the central power in the Empire they renewed their attacks (1038). It will be recalled that the Papacy, which at first favoured a triple *entente* (Rome-Constantinople-German Empire) directed against the Normans, reversed its policy under Pope Nicholas II (1059–1061). At the Council of Melfi an alliance was concluded between the Papacy and the Normans. At the same time, after the accession of Pope Leo IX (in 1048), the Roman Church took up a policy of ecclesiastical reform, which in its initial stage had the support of the German Emperor. The new Pope made his authority felt in Southern Italy (Councils of Salerno and Siponto, 1050). He was supported in his efforts by Cardinal Humbert, who was soon to receive the title of Archbishop of Sicily.[29] We have only to remem-

[27] J. Gay, op. cit., p. 359.

[28] See V. Grumel, *Les préliminaires du schisme de Michel Cérulaiee, ou la question romaine avant 1054*, Rev. des Et. Byz., t. X, 1952, p. 19, note 2.

[29] See A. Michel, *Die Römischen Antgriffe auf Michael Kerullarios wegen Antiocheia (1053/54)*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 44 Band (1951), Heft 1/2, München, pp. 419–27. In particular, the author gives several references for the use of this title by Humbert.

F E T Y A F I L M

ber that for three centuries Rome had not exercised her patriarchal jurisdiction over this island, to understand the nature and the aim of the new programme which was implied in this title.

Needless to say, the agreement concluded in Melfi was essentially directed against Byzantium; in fact, the Norman chief, Robert Guiscard, actually swore to put his armed forces at the disposal of the Papacy to safeguard and enlarge "the Sovereign rights of St. Peter," and he promised to place under the authority of the Roman see all churches situated on territories under his rule.[30]

The year 1071 was a black one for the Byzantine Empire. On April 16th, after a long siege, Bari fell into the hands of Guiscard, while on August 26th the Imperial forces were defeated at Mantzikert, and Byzantium lost the greater part of Asia Minor. Having lost so much ground, Byzantium could not but recognize the new state of affairs in Italy, and in 1074 Guiscard received a Court title of "Nobelisimos"; in return for this honour, he promised not to attack the Empire, and even to render it assistance.[31] With the capture of Sicily from the Saracens the Normans achieved complete domination of Southern Italy.

It would be natural to assume that the Norman conquest led at once to the general suppression of the Greek rite in favour of the Latin. This, in fact, was what Rome wished for, but the new masters of the country proceeded with caution. We must not forget that the extreme south of the peninsula was entirely hellenized; in addition, the Greeks of Sicily had greeted the Normans as liberators: and after the conquest of Palermo (in 1072), the cathedral which had been transformed into a mosque by the Moslems, was handed back to the Greek bishop Nicodemus: however, he was succeeded on his death by a Latin bishop. The first metropolitan see to be latinized was that of Reggio (*c.* 1089). In 1094 the sees of Nicastro and Tropea (=Neocastron and Tropaion) had Latin pastors. At the same time, many dioceses retained the Greek rite until the end of the Middle Ages or even later. Even when Latin bishops replaced the Greek, the clergy of the Oriental rite was maintained, with its peculiar titles and dignities (e.g. that of "Protopappas"). The Byzantine form of monasticism, which in the West has somewhat inappropriately been called "Basilian," prospered under the protection of the Norman princes during the first sixty or seventy years of the twelfth century; new monasteries were even founded, for example, the monastery of St. Saviour's in Messina (*c.* 1130). However, the Normans made an effort to counterbalance the influence of Greek monasticism by establishing Latin monasteries, such as the monastery of Saint-Euphemia[32]; later, other religious orders—e.g. the Carthusians and the Cistercians—established themselves alongside the Benedictines. During the reign of King William II (1171–89) there begins the unavoidable decline of Eastern monasticism in the Norman state, while the decline of the secular

[30] See Fliche et Martin, op. cit., t. 8, p. 21.

[31] See P. Charanis, *Byzantium, the West, and the Origin of the First Crusade*, in Byzantion, t. XIX (1949), pp. 17–36.

[32] See Lynn Townsend White, op. cit., passim; also P. F. Russo, *Attività artistico-culturale del Monachismo calabro-greco anteriormente all'epoca normanna*, Actes du Congres de Palerme, Vol. I, Rome, 1953, especially p. 466.

clergy was by that time a *fait accompli*. It should be noted that the Latin rite penetrated back into Calabria more rapidly than one could have expected, and fifty years after the Norman conquest, it was on the whole solidly established in the country; this fact can be explained by a combination of political circumstances and the inferior social status of the secular clergy. The question of ecclesiastical relations between the Greeks, or the hellenized Italians, and the Normans who were vassals of Rome, was not concerned solely with the liturgical language and other ritual practices: it raised a fundamental problem of faith. For we must not forget that the Norman conquest of Southern Italy took place just at the time when the historical process which led to the religious separation of East and West had reached its climax. The Council of Bari (1098), over which Pope Urban II presided in person, was summoned with the specific object of persuading the Greek clergy in Southern Italy, and especially the episcopate, to enter into communion with the Western Church. It will be recalled that Anselm of Canterbury, the foremost Latin theologian of the day, took an active part in the Council. One hundred and eighty-three bishops, both Latin and Greek, were present. A sharp dispute arose over the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit; the Pope, incapable of replying to the arguments pressed forward by the Greeks, appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who tried to prove the soundness of the Western thesis.[33] We cannot here discuss in detail the arguments set forth by Anselm; he took as his starting point the Unity of the Divine Essence and based the distinction of the Persons on the opposition of relations of origin, laying down the principle which subsequently became the classic postulate of the scholastic doctrine of the Trinity: "Nec unitas amittat aliquando suam consequentiam ubi non obviat aliqua relationis oppositio." Taking this as his starting point, he found it easy to deduce that the Holy Spirit must proceed not only from the Father, but also from the Son, otherwise He could not in any way be distinguished from the latter. The Greeks accused the Latins of introducing a duality of causes into the Trinity; in reply Anselm insisted that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from that in which the Father is distinct from the Son, but from that in which they are One; this point, incidentally, is in agreement with the teaching of St. Augustine (cf. *De Trinit.* V, xiv, par. 15). Disconcerted by this method of argument which was completely foreign to them, the Italo-Greek prelates did not know what to reply; and finally, an anathema was pronounced against any one who would not adhere to the doctrine of the Double Procession. The integration of Southern Italy into the Western world was thus completed by the submission of the churches of that region to Rome.

But the Byzantines, in spite of all the concessions that they had been forced to make, did not in theory renounce their claim to this country; in 1155, during the reign of the Emperor Manuel, they even made an ephemeral attempt to re-establish a foothold there. But the decline of Byzantium, which gathered momentum after the death of this Emperor

[33] See B. Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du onzième siècle*, Paris, 1924, p. 290 et seq.; also Anselm, *De Processione Spiritus Sancti contra Græcos*, Migne P.L., CLVIII, 285–326, especially 288.

(†1180) prevented a renewal of any such attempt. In spite of all that had happened, the *notitiae episcopatuum* written after the loss of Southern Italy continue to mention the metropolitan sees of this country; such were the *notitiae* compiled in the reign of Manuel Comnenus (1143–80) and at the time of Andronicus II Palaeologus (1282–1328).[34] An Ekthesis drawn up during the reign of Andronicus III (1328–41) assigns the following places to the Italian metropolitan sees of the patriarchate of Constantinople: Reggio, 31st place; Catania, 44th; Santa Severina, 48th; Otranto, 53rd.[35] This, however, had no relation to fact, as the ecumenical patriarchs had had no effective jurisdiction there since the end of the eleventh century. It would seem, nevertheless, that till the fifteenth century the submission of the Greeks in Italy was often nominal, and one can even find evidence of occasional intervention on the part of the Church in Constantinople[36]; furthermore, it seems that the Orthodox tradition survived in certain monasteries.[37] The Greek rite never completely disappeared; after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, Greek and Albanian refugees came to live in Southern Italy and in Sicily, and this emigration continued until the sixteenth and even the seventeenth centuries. But these peoples were allowed to preserve their Eastern rite only on condition that they submitted to the Church of Rome; in 1742 Pope Benedict XIV gave them a statute, *Etsi pastoralis*, which governs them to this day. As in the majority of Uniate communities, the Eastern rite has undergone certain changes, in spite of the fact that Pope Leo XIII ordered the suppression of any innovation incompatible with the Byzantine rite. Of all the Greek monasteries in Italy one only has survived to our day, the abbey of Grottaferrata, founded in 1004 by St. Nilus.[38]

When in our own day we see the Ecumenical Patriarchs conferring on bishops under their jurisdiction resident in Western countries titles derived from their former Italian and Sicilian dioceses, we are reminded of the era when the glory of their see was such as to dim the splendour of the Old Rome even within her own metropolitan province.

PAUL L'HUILLIER.

[34] Gelzer, op. cit., pp. 585–6 and 597–601.

[35] Ibid., pp. 607–9.

[36] See S. Lambros, Ὀκτὼ ἀνέκδοτα ἔγγραφα ἀφ' ὧν πέντε ἐκ τῆς Σικελίας καὶ τῆς κάτω Ἰταλίας, Neos Hellenomnemon, VII, A, Athens, 1910, pp. 26–48.

[37] Thus for example the great adversary of the Hesychasts, the Calabrian monk Barlaam, considered himself during the first part of his life, that is until 1341, as belonging to the Orthodox Church, and even took an active part in anti-Latin polemics. According to his own witness, Barlaam, who was a native of Seminara in Calabria, was born into Eastern Orthodoxy. See M. Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium*, t. 2, Paris, 1933, p. 372, note 1.

[38] See R. Webster, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. VII, pp. 40–1, and A. Rocchi, *De Cœnobio Cryptoferratensi ejusque bibliotheca et codicibus præsertim Græcis commentarii*, Tusculum, 1893: also the general work, *Il Monachismo basiliano nella Sicilia medievale*, Rome, 1947.

THE BROTHER-LOVING POOR MAN

(Πτωχὸς Φιλάδελφος)

The Mystical Autobiography of St. Symeon the New Theologian

(A.D. *949–1022*) [1]

ANY one desiring to study Orthodox mysticism in its most profound and genuine expression could scarcely find a better source for such research than the personality and writings of the great Byzantine mystic, St. Symeon the New Theologian. In this case we have the advantage of a quite remarkable Life of the saint written by his disciple, Nicetas Stethatos.[2] More important still, and at the same time rare in the history of saints, we also possess many of his own writings[3] of a highly personal

[1] Paper read on August 7th, 1953, at the annual conference of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius at Abingdon.

[2] First edition of the original Greek text of the *Life:* "Un grand mystique Byzantin. Vie de Symeon le Nouveau Théologien par Nicétas Stethatos. Text grec inédit . . . par le P. Irénée Hausherr S.J." in *Orientalia Christiana*, 12 (1928). With a French translation and a long introduction, it is quite important for the establishment of chronological dates, etc., but in its characterization of the personality of St. Symeon and the treatment of his spiritual doctrine it is more contestable. In his edition of the text Père Hausherr confined himself to the Western manuscripts of the *Life* (ignoring the libraries of Mount Athos). He was sharply (and, perhaps, even with some exaggeration and lack of objectivity) criticized by V. Laurent, A.A., in his article: "Un nouveau monument hagiographique. La Vie de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien," *Echos d'Orient*, 28 (1929), pp. 431–443.

[3] It may seem incredible (and it certainly is a great disgrace to Orthodox theology and Byzantine studies) that the greater part of St. Symeon's writings remains unpublished in its original Greek text to the present day, so that we are obliged to study them in manuscripts or unsatisfactory translations. As a matter of fact, only a part of his "Hymns" were published at the end of the eighteenth century in their original text by Dionysios Zagoraios in a very defective manner together with his modern Greek translation of other works of St. Symeon (1st ed. Venice 1790; 2nd ed. Syros (= Smyrna) 1886). At almost the same time Nicodemos Agioritis and Macarios of Corinth edited his "κεφάλαια" (capita) in Philocalia, but also incompletely and uncritically (1st ed. Venice 1782; 2nd ed. Athens 1893, t. 2, pp. 151–172. Reprinted in Migne 120, 604–688). In the West, Professor Paul Maas edited some passages from the "Hymns" (omitted by Dionysios Zagoraios) in his article: "Aus der Poesie des Mystikers Symeon" (Beiträge zur Geschichte des christlichen Altertums und der Byzantinischen Literatur-Festgabe Albert Ehrhard, Bonn, 1922, pp. 328–341). Taken out of their context however, these extracts do not give an adequate example of St. Symeon's poetry and may even be misleading. Rev. I. Hausherr also edited in *Orientalia Christiana*, 9 (1927) the text of the fifth "Ethical Oration" of St. Symeon (pp. 77–113) and the treatise "On Prayer and Attention" (ibidem), traditionally attributed to St. Symeon, but of doubtful genuineness. Approximatively, this is all so far as concerns editions of the original text. As translations we have firstly the already mentioned work of Dionysios Zagoraios. It includes the greater part of the "Sermons" and was done from various Athonite manuscripts, but it is to be regretted that Dionysios omits to publish together with his translation the original text (except for the "Hymns" which he leaves untranslated). From this Modern Greek translation the "Sermons" have been translated into Russian by Bishop Theophan (1st ed. Moscow 1882; 2nd ed. 1890). All these translations are incomplete, with important and often tendencious omissions and alterations and are therefore unsuitable for theological or historical studies. Nearly the same thing may be said of the Latin translation of 33 Sermons and 40 Hymns by Pontanus published in 1603 at Ingolstadt (reprinted in Migne 120, 321–602). Moreover for his translation Pontanus uses a Greek manuscript in which the "Sermons" are not presented in their original form, but in a later recession and adaptation, devoid of great interest. The "Hymns" were translated into Russian by the hieromonk Panteleimon Ouspensky (ed. in Sergiev Posad. 1917), but he also confines himself to the text of Dionysios. There is also a German translation of the "Hymns" (K. Kirchhoff, O.F.M., *Symeon der Neue Theologe. Licht vom Licht. Hymnen.* Kellerau, 1930; 2nd ed. 1950), but as being done from the Latin text of Pontanus it cannot certainly have any pretention to scholarly value. Panteleimon Ouspensky was preparing before the first world war an edition of the Greek text of the writings of St. Symeon, but historical events and his death did not allow him to carry out his project. On the questions of revisions and translations of the writings of St. Symeon we have written with more detail in our paper for the Ninth

and autobiographical character. They are not so rich as regards the external facts of his life, but are of immense value for the study of his interior spiritual development. For this reason we decidedly prefer to use them for the present essay on the spiritual characteristics of St. Symeon, rather than Nicetas's Life, which, although it provides us with important data on the career of the Saint, nevertheless fails to give us a vivid and intelligible picture of his personality and mystical development. In many respects Nicetas conventionalizes St. Symeon, and diminishes the dramatic elements in his spiritual growth. He makes of him an *ikon* almost from the beginning of his life, similar to the *ikons* of other saints, thus to a certain degree depriving St. Symeon of his unique individuality, humanity, real sanctity, and mysticism. Fortunately the Saint's own writings, always so sincere and so genuine, enable us to restore his real image, his genuine *ikon* in the most profound sense of this word.

Two groups of St. Symeon's writings are particularly important for the understanding of the spiritual development of his personality—the "Catechetical Sermons" (or "Catecheses"), and the "Hymns." The "Catecheses" (thirty-six in all) are mainly sermons addressed by the Saint to his monks while he was Abbot of the Monastery of St. Mamas in Constantinople.[4] The "Hymns" seem to belong for the most part to a later period of his life.[5] Constituting the most sublime part of all St. Symeon's literary remains, they treat mainly of the highest states of the mystical life, and give less material for his spiritual story than some of the "Catecheses." And as no critical edition of the text of the "Hymns" yet exists, we shall confine ourselves in the present paper to the "Catecheses," studied by us in their original text and manuscript tradition, framing them in the data provided by Nicetas's Life of the Saint. There is, however, some difficulty created by the fact that, besides many mystical passages where St. Symeon speaks of his experiences in the first person, there are others which would

Byzantine Congress at Thessalonica entitled: "The original form and later redactions of the sermon of St. Symeon the New Theologian" (which will be published in the Acts of the Congress) and in my article: "Note on an unpublished sermon of St. Symeon the New Theologian" (in Russian) in *Messager de l'Exarchat du Patriarche Russe en Europe Occidentale*, N. 12 (1952), Paris.

[4] The "Catechetical Sermons," together with two other groups of St. Symeon's orations (the Theological and the Ethical), belong to the most ancient collections of his sermons preserved until our time in a shape comparatively near to their original form. Already mentioned by Nicetas Stethatos (see *Life*, ch. 37, 11–15 and 133, 33–38) and testified by the eleventh century manuscript of the National Library of Paris (Paris, Gr. 895), the "Catecheses" mainly belong to the period A.D. 980–1005 when St. Symeon was abbot of the Monastery of St. Mamas. The origin of this collection is however more complicated, and some parts of it (as e.g. Cat. 20) seem rather to be letters written by St. Symeon to his spiritual disciples, than sermons addressed to the monks of his monastery. The two "Thanksgivings" (Εὐχαριστία) stand quite apart. They constitute the introductory and final pieces of the collection. They are a kind of confession and prayer to God with an emphasized autobiographical character and do not seem to have been ever pronounced as sermons. Nevertheless, the personality of St. Symeon the New Theologian is so vividly felt everywhere, that it gives a profound interior unity to the whole collection of "Catecheses." For some years we have been working on a critical edition of the Greek text of the "Catechetical Sermons" and, in collaboration with Professor J. M. Hussey, hope to publish it together with an English translation, comparatively soon.

[5] See *Life*, ch. 111, 7–10, where Nicetas ascribes the composition of the "Hymns" to the period after the exile of the saint, when he founded the monastery of St. Marina on the Asiatic side of Constantinople (that is after A.D. 1009). However, some of the "Hymns" seem to have been written much earlier, as Nicetas states (*Life*, ch. 37, 11–15).

seem not less biographical, but are related in the third person, as if describing what had happened to somebody else. How far may we use such passages as material for a spiritual biography of St. Symeon? It is not always easy to answer this question, as it is sometimes not easy to reconcile different sayings of the Saint among themselves. However, generally speaking we seem to be authorized to use them, as most of these passages in the third person are to be found in other sermons of St. Symeon related (often with some omissions) in the first person as of things which had happened to himself.

St. Symeon the New Theologian was born in the province of Paphlagonia in Asia Minor in the middle of the tenth century, of parents belonging to the wealthy and influential Byzantine provincial gentry.[6] It was during the period of the Macedonian Dynasty, one of the best periods in Byzantine history: and the life of St. Symeon coincides with the reign of the most brilliant and successful representative of this dynasty, Basil II, "the Bulgar-Slayer." As a young boy of about eleven, St. Symeon was brought by his father to Constantinople to study in the schools there, with a view to entering afterwards the Imperial service. His uncle, Basil, had an important post at court, and intended to introduce his nephew to the Emperor himself: but this the young Symeon declined, as he also refused to continue his education in a higher school after completing his studies in a middle school.[7] Later on, St. Symeon described himself in this period of his life somewhat ironically, "A certain young man, about twenty years old was living in Constantinople in our time. He was handsome in appearance, and possessed a showy exterior, manners, and gait, so that some people even had bad suspicions on his account."[8] He seems to have led then the dissipated life of a young man of the Capital: but he was profoundly dissatisfied by his service in his uncle's house, and by his life in general. "I thank thee, O Master, Lord of heaven and earth," he writes later, remembering this period, "that when I threw myself down a cliff, senseless and contemptuous, like a horse that has broken its traces, and slipped away from thy power, and was lying in the ditch, rolling about without feeling, and more and more crushed, thou didst not permit me to lie there to be defiled by the filth, but in thy mercy didst send and bring me from thence. And thou gavest me honour more splendid, delivering me from kings and rulers who intended to use me as a paltry vessel to serve their will."[9] Influenced, it seems, by religious books, the *Lives of the Saints* in particular, the young Symeon felt keenly the worthlessness of his present state: and in his desire to find a way to God, he began to search for a holy man who could direct him and effect his reconciliation with God.[10] But

[6] *Life*, ch. 2. Much important information on the historical background of the life of St. Symeon may be found in Professor J. M. Hussey's interesting book, *Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire* (867–1185), Oxford, 1937. Professor J. M. Hussey consecrates to St. Symeon three chapters of her book (especially ch. 11, An eleventh century mystic, Symeon the Young, pp. 201–225).

[7] *Life*, ch. 2.

[8] Cat. (= Catechesis) 22, ll. 21–25. For obvious reasons we are obliged to give references to our unpublished typewritten Greek text of the Catecheses. The English translation, made by us for the present paper, should not be considered as final.

[9] Euch. (= Eucharistic–Thanksgiving) 1, ll. 1–33 (in abbreviation).

[10] Euch. 2, 69–72.

his efforts did not meet with much understanding from his associates. "I heard all telling me with one accord," he writes, "that such a holy man does not now exist on the earth: and hearing this, I fell into greater sorrow." [11] Here, however, the strength of faith and confidence in God, which were always so characteristic of Symeon, clearly appear. "I never believed this," he says, "and I answered such persons, 'My Lord, have mercy upon me! Is it possible that the devil has become so much mightier than the Master, as to drag every one to himself, and make of them his partisans, so that no one is left on the side of God?'" [12]

This great faith did not remain unanswered. Symeon met the holy man — for whom he was seeking, in the person of an old monk of the celebrated monastery of the Studion, who was also called Symeon. A new period in the life of the young Symeon begins through this acquaintance. Externally, he continued to work in the world as before: but he frequently visited his spiritual father, and fervently carried out his instructions. But at first St. Symeon the Studite restricted himself to giving his disciple only "a small commandment for reminding" to be carried out by him. When he asked for spiritual reading, he gave him the book *On the Spiritual Law* by the fifth century ascetic writer, Mark.[13] Among the sentences in this book which struck the mind of the young Symeon, one in particular made a deep impression on him: "If thou seek for healing, take care of thy conscience, and do whatsoever it telleth thee, and thou shalt find the profit thereof." [14] "From this moment," says St. Symeon, writing about himself in the third person, "he never went to sleep with his conscience convicting him and saying, 'Why hast thou not done this?'" [15] "Wounded by the love and the desire of the Lord, he sought with hope the First Beauty," [16] and in his juvenile fervour put into practice the sentence of Mark by adding more and more to his nightly prayers, as his conscience suggested to him, "because during the day he was directing the house of one of the patricians, and visited every day the palace taking care of the things that were essential, so that no one could guess what was happening to him." [17] But his nights were devoted to ardent prayer described by St. Symeon with the features usual for beginners in the spiritual life: "Tears poured from his eyes every evening, and he fell more and more often on his knees with his face to the ground, or stood with his feet fixed together and motionless. Prayers to the God-Bearer were read by him tensely with sighings and tears. And as if the Lord were corporeally present, he would throw himself at His immaculate feet, and ask like the blind man for mercy, and to receive his spiritual sight." [18]

It was in one of these nightly prayers that St. Symeon had his first mystical vision. "While he was standing one night," writes he, "and say-

[11] Euch. 2, 72–74.
[12] Euch. 2, 74–79.
[13] Cat. 22, 27–36. This treatise of St. Mark the Monk is printed in Migne 65, 905–929.
[14] Cat. 22, 39–40. Cf. Mark the Monk, *On the Spiritual Law*, ch. 69 in Migne 65, col. 913 c.
[15] Cat. 22, 61–62.
[16] Cat. 22, 52–54.
[17] Cat. 22, 65–68.
[18] Cat. 22, 68–75.

ing more with the mind than with the mouth, 'God, be merciful to me a sinner,' a divine shining suddenly appeared in abundance from above, filling all the place. And when this happened, the young man could discern no more, and forgot whether he was in a house or under a roof, because he only saw light on every side, and did not even know whether he was walking on the earth. No fear of falling was in him, neither did he care for the world, nor did any of the things, which men in the body think of, then strike his mind. But being entirely given up to the immaterial light, and seemingly having become light himself and having forgotten all the world, he was completely filled with tears, and unutterable joy and exultation. Then his mind mounted to heaven, and he saw another light still brighter than the first. Then unexpectedly there appeared to him, standing near this other light, the holy and angelic old man who had given him the commandment and the book" (his spiritual father, St. Symeon the Studite).[19]

This vision however passed quickly, and St. Symeon "came again to himself," "being held by joy and surprise. He was crying from his heart, and sweetness followed the tears," he says.[20] That night even the thought of sleep could not enter his mind. But the remarkable thing is that this first period of religious enthusiasm and mystical enlightenment granted to St. Symeon, as he thinks, through the prayers of his spiritual father, in whom he had such a sincere faith, did not last long, and the young Symeon apparently returned to his previous dissipated and worldly life, if not even worse. "After this marvellous alteration," he himself says, "not many days had passed, when continual temptations fell upon me. I was hindered by them from my secret spiritual work, and little by little deprived of the good. . . . Gradually forgetting all that I have described, I fell down to a complete darkness, so that I could not even remember anything, little or great, of what I have been speaking of. . . . I was in such a state as if I had never understood or heard the holy words of Christ. And I looked on the holy man who had pitied me, and given me the little commandment and sent me the book, as an ordinary man. And I had not the slightest consideration for the vision which I had seen thanks to him."[21] In one of his other writings, St. Symeon speaks even more strongly of these years of backsliding which followed his first mystical experience: "I did not understand the miracle that had happened to me: and being little by little led astray by laziness and negligence, I fell into my former evils, and even worse."[22] Or as he says elsewhere: "Having reckoned all this as nothing, I threw myself again into the pit, and the deep mud of shameful thoughts and actions. And having descended there, I fell into the power of those who were hidden in the darkness, so that neither I alone nor all the world gathered together could bring me up from thence and deliver me from their hands."[23] It seems however that even in this period of backsliding (which lasted about six or seven years) Symeon did not completely break off rela-

[19] Cat. 22, 81–96.
[20] Cat. 22, 100–103.
[21] Cat. 22, 252–271 (abbreviated).
[22] Euch. 2, 105–107.
[23] Euch. 1, 36–43.

tions with his spiritual father. "I do not know how to say it," he writes, "but in an unconscious way love and faith in the holy old man remained in my miserable heart. For the sake of this, I think, and of his prayers, the man-loving God had mercy upon me after the passing of so many years. And through him He again delivered me, snatching me away from the great deceit and the depth of evil. For I, the unworthy, did not entirely withdraw myself from him, but confessed to him what was happening to me, and visited him often in his cell when I happened to be in town, even though I, the unscrupulous, was not keeping his commandments." [24]

However, it is to a new direct and miraculous intervention of God that St. Symeon ascribes his second and final liberation from the powers of evil. So he describes it in one of his best writings in these dramatic terms: "However when I was being held in that place, and miserably and pitifully dragged about and stifled and mocked by these robbers, thou, O compassionate and Man-loving Master, didst not despise me, nor resent my evil deeds, nor turn thyself away from my ungrateful mind. Thou didst not leave me to be freely tyrannized over by the robbers. And even if I rejoiced to be led away insensibly by them, thou, O Master, didst not endure to see me drawn and led shamefully around. But thou thyself, moved by thine own inward goodness, didst bend down to the deepest depths, and stretch out thine immaculate hand to me, who was sitting somewhere therein covered with mud. Though I saw it not (for how could I, or in general how could I look up, being covered and drowned in filth?), thou didst take hold of the hairs of my head, and draw me up from thence, dragging me with violence. I felt the pain, and the rapid motion upwards, but knew not by whom I was being lifted up, nor who it could be who was holding me and drawing me. But, having lifted me up and set me on the earth, thou didst hand me over to thy servant and disciple, entirely filthy, and with eyes, ears and mouth blocked with mud. And being thus, I could not see Thee, who Thou mightest be, but only knew that Thou wast someone kind and man-loving, who hadst led me out of that deepest ditch and filth." [25]

This miraculous rescue from the ditch apparently corresponds with the decision of St. Symeon definitely to leave the world and become a monk. As we know from the *Life*, he entered the Monastery of the Studion as a novice at the age of about twenty-seven. There he found his old beloved spiritual father, St. Symeon the Studite. And immediately he became his faithful disciple, showing great zeal in following his instructions, and in ascetic life generally. But such a particular attachment to his spiritual father soon provoked disapproval among the monks of the cenobitic monastery, where so much stress was laid on discipline and uniformity, and on the monarchical authority of the Abbot. St. Symeon was summoned by the latter several times, and ordered to conform more to the rules of the community, and to abandon his spiritual father. He refused, and was expelled from the Monastery. It is not difficult to understand that St. Symeon preferred to be expelled rather than abandon his spiritual

[24] Cat. 22, 275–283.
[25] Euch. 1, 44–63.

father, to whom he owed everything spiritually, and who was shown to him by God Himself, as St. Symeon was strongly convinced. He again entered as a novice into the neighbouring little monastery of St. Mamas of Xylokerkos, but continued to be under the spiritual direction of St. Symeon the Studite, who remained in the Monastery of Studion. In his new monastery, St. Symeon the New Theologian was soon professed as a monk, and ordained priest. Then after three years, at the age of approximately thirty-one, he was elected Abbot by the monks of St. Mamas, with the approval of the Patriarch Nicolas Chrysovergos.[26] By this time he was already beginning to be a celebrity in Constantinople, well known for his holiness and wisdom, his remarkable preaching and writings, loved and venerated by many, but criticized and attacked by others.

Such, briefly, are the facts as they appear in Nicetas's *Life*. St. Symeon's own writings reveal to us the inner, spiritual side of these events. From them we learn that, in contrast to the facility of his first steps in the spiritual life, which quickly led the young Symeon to his first vision of Divine Light, he was now obliged to tread with patience a long, laborious and painful way towards spiritual healing. He summarizes the first part of it in these words: "By many toils, and even more tears, by strict estrangement and complete obedience, by the entire cutting out of my own will, and by many other harder ways of living and actions was I going forward on an irresistible course. And thus was I again deemed meet somehow to see faintly a small ray of that most sweet and Divine Light. But such a vision as that which I had seen at first, never was I deemed worthy to see until now."[27] In another writing, St. Symeon gives much more striking details, and proceeds farther in his confessions: "According to Thine order, All-Holy Master, I followed without turning back the man whom Thou didst show me. And with great labour he led me up to the sources and to the streams, drawing me, who was blind, behind him by the hand of grace which Thou gavest me. I was obliged to follow. But while he, as one who sees, lifted up his feet and passed without trouble by all the stones, pits and traps, I stumbled upon them all, and fell into them, and so suffered many pains and afflictions. But he washed and bathed himself in every spring and stream, while I, being blind, passed by most of them. . . . Many times he showed me the source, and left me to wash myself. But I with the palms of my hands collected, together with the clear water, clay and filth which lay near the source, and with them would defile my face. Many times when searching for the source, and touching it with my hands, but not seeing it at all, I drew its water together with earth, and stirred up the mud: and while I was defiling my face with filth, I supposed I was washing it well in clean water."[28]

"How shall I tell in detail," exclaims the Saint, "the distress and violence of all this?"[29] And his afflictions were made even more intolerable by the opposition of those around him (the monks of the Studion, we may suppose), and their lack of understanding of his spiritual way. "Why dost thou

[26] See *Life*, ch. 30, 3–5. This happened about A.D. 980.
[27] Cat. 22, 287–294.
[28] Euch. 1, 72–92 (with omissions).
[29] Euch. 1, 93–94.

labour in vain," they would tell him, "acting senselessly, and follow that deceiver and impostor, vainly and unprofitably expecting to recover thy sight? But this is not now possible. Why dost thou not come rather to merciful men, who ask only to give thee rest, to feed thee and serve thee well? It is not possible to be delivered from this leprosy of the soul. . . . Whence has this deceiver appeared, this wonder-worker of our times, who promises thee things which are not possible for any man of our generation? . . . In general, what power has he? Dost thou not think so about it thyself even without us? Or are we, perhaps, all blind, as this man who has gone astray tells thee? Truly, we all do see, and—be not deceived—there exists no other greater recovery of sight than ours." [30] Nothing, however, could divert St. Symeon from the way he had chosen once and for all. "But Thou didst deliver me, O Thou Merciful," says he in his thanksgiving to God, "through the faith and hope that Thou hast granted me, from those real impostors and deceivers: and this faith and hope has given me strength to bear all this patiently, and even more." [31]

It would be too long to describe here all the stages of St. Symeon's way to the Light. We shall note only the most important moments as he describes them himself. "While I was bearing all this with patience," he writes, "and was bathing and washing myself every day, as I supposed, in these turbid waters . . . and as I was running towards the source, Thou Thyself who hadst pulled me out of the filth, didst again set me on the way. Then for the first time didst Thou flash the immaculate radiance of Thy face about my feeble eyes. And being unable to know Thee, I lost even the sight which it seemed to me that I possessed. And how could I see Thee Thyself, or know Thee who Thou mightest be, when I had not strength enough to look at the radiance of Thy grace, to perceive and observe it? Thereafter, while I was standing near the source, Thou who art not proud, didst not deem it unworthy of Thee to descend more often. Coming and holding my head, Thou didst dip it in the waters, and madest me see more clearly the light of Thy face. But immediately Thou didst fly away, without giving me the possibility to understand who it was who was doing this, or whence Thou camest, or whither Thou wast going. . . . And after continuing for a time to do thus, Thou didst vouchsafe me to see an awful thing and a mystery . . . I saw the lightnings shine around me, and the rays of Thy face mingled with the waters. And I was astonished to see that I was washing myself with luminous water. But I did not know where it was, or whence, or who provided it: only I still rejoiced in washing myself, increasing in faith, and lifted on the wings of hope. Afterwards . . . Thou didst deign to show me, through an opened heaven, Thy face from above as a sun without form. But even thus Thou didst not give me to know who Thou art. And how was it possible, when Thou hadst not spoken to me? But Thou didst hide Thyself immediately: and I was yearning to see Thy shape, and to know clearly who Thou art. Therefore I was crying continually, from the great violence, and from the fire of love, not knowing who Thou art, who didst create me from nothingness into

[30] Euch. 1, 95–112 (abbreviated).
[31] Euch. 1, 113–117.

being, and didst pull me out of the filth, and becamest to me all that of which I have spoken." [32]

It is very remarkable how St. Symeon continually stresses the fact that, in spite of his many mystical visions and illuminations, he did not yet know God, nor was he clearly and consciously aware who it was who appeared to him and whom he saw. Therefore in spite of all his visions he was profoundly dissatisfied. This is certainly one of the most characteristic features of the spirituality of St. Symeon the New Theologian. We hear so often that the mysticism of the Eastern Church is a mysticism of Light, and that the vision of Light is the highest mystical event in Orthodox spiritual life. In the case of St. Symeon, however, such a statement could be accepted only with important qualifications. It is not the vision of Light in itself that constitutes for him the central moment and summit of mystical life, but the personal contact with Christ who reveals Himself through the Light, and the mutual knowledge and communion with Christ. And it is only from the moment when Christ begins to speak with us in our heart through His Holy Spirit, that we acquire a personal knowledge of Him. A mere vision of Light does not give this: therefore it fills us with violent longing, and mystical dissatisfaction. "I still did not know Thee, Master," writes St. Symeon after he had received many revelations, "that it was indeed Thou. I did not yet know that it was Thou Thyself, my not proud God and Lord. I was not yet vouchsafed to hear Thy voice, so that I might know Thee. And Thou hadst not yet mystically told me, 'It is I.'" [33] "I saw Thee thus, my God . . . but I did not understand that it was God, or the glory of God, which appeared to me at one time thus, and at another in a different way. But the unaccustomedness of the miracle struck me with amazement, and filled all my soul and heart with joy, so that I thought that even my body was participating in that unutterable joy: and yet I did not clearly know who was appearing to me. I now saw the Light more often; sometimes inside me, when my soul was enjoying calm and peace; sometimes it appeared far beyond me, or even entirely hid itself: and hiding itself, it would cause me an unendurable pain, as I thought that it would never appear any more." [34] At last, after many dramatic apparitions and recessions, comes the decisive moment, when Christ begins to speak. "When we ascend to a more perfect stage," writes St. Symeon, "the shapeless and formless One comes no more shapeless and formless as before, nor makes known to us in silence the presence and arrival of His Light. But how? In a certain shape, albeit of God, though God is neither in form nor in figure; but He shows Himself simple, in an inconceivable and incomprehensible Light. Now He shows Himself openly, and makes Himself known very knowingly, and the Invisible is seen quite clearly. He speaks and hears invisibly; and as friend to friend, He who is God by nature converses with gods born of Him by grace. And as a Father He loves and is loved with great warmth by His sons. And He becomes to them a strange spectacle, and even more awful hearing, which can neither

[32] Euch. 1, 118–173 (abbreviated).
[33] Euch. 2, 144–148.
[34] Euch. 2, 151–163.

be spoken of, nor can one endure to conceal it in silence."[35] Or as St. Symeon says elsewhere: "Thus, O Master, Thou who art immoveable didst seem to *come*, Thou who art unchangeable, to increase; Thou who art shapeless, to acquire a shape. . . . And having overshone me, Thou didst appear to me, who, it seemed, could now see Thee perfectly well. And when I asked Thee, 'Who mightest Thou be, O Master?' for the first time Thou didst vouchsafe me, the prodigal, the sound of Thy voice. And while I was amazed and struck with astonishment, trembling, and thinking somehow within myself, and saying, 'What could this glory and the greatness of this splendour mean? How and whence have I been deemed meet to receive such great goodness?'—thus didst Thou gently address me, saying, 'I am God, who for thy sake became man. And because thou hast sought for me with all thy soul, behold from now on thou shalt be my brother, my fellow-heir and my friend.' And I was astonished by this, and my soul was poured out, and my strength dispersed, and I answered, 'And who am I, Master, or what have I done, that Thou shouldest deem a wretch like me meet for such goodness, and make me a partaker in this glory, and Thy fellow-heir?' Thou, O Master, didst again tell me, as conversing with a friend, through Thy Spirit which was speaking in me, 'All this have I granted thee for thine intention alone, and thy resolution and faith. And I shall grant it thee again."[36] In another place St. Symeon relates how this mystical communion with Christ later became to him a constant interior state: "When I desired to see Thee again," he says, "and once went to the immaculate ikon of her who gave Thee birth, to salute it and fall down before it, Thou didst appear to me before I stood up, in my suffering heart, making it like the light. And then I knew that I consciously possessed Thee in me. From that moment I no longer loved Thee and Thy properties as a remembrance, in their memory only, but I believed that I had Thee truly in me, O Personal and Essential Love, for Thou art the real Love, O God."[37]

It was impossible for St. Symeon to keep this great revelation as a secret. And in his ardent desire to make every one partaker of the same grace, he felt himself compelled by love for his brethren to reveal to them his mystical experience, and to call on them to follow his spiritual way. He was strongly convinced that Christ will grant the same fullness of grace to every one who will but seek it with all his heart. "How can we be silent," he writes, "about such a magnitude of the Lord's benefactions, or thanklessly bury in the earth, like ungrateful and wicked servants, the talent given to us?"[38] And he explains it in the following beautiful images: "As some poor man who loves his brethren (πτωχὸς φιλάδελφος), and has asked and received a coin from some Christ-loving and merciful person, runs with joy to his fellows in poverty, and makes this known to them, saying secretly, 'You also, run in haste in order to receive'; and he shows them, and points out with his finger, the person who gave him the coin; and if they disbelieve, he shows them the coin itself, revealing it in his palm, so that they may

[35] Euch. 2, 182–195.
[36] Euch. 1, 192–226 (abbreviated).
[37] Euch. 1, 244–252.
[38] Cat. 34, 22–24.

believe, and hasten, and quickly catch up that merciful man; in the same way I also, a humble poor man, destitute of all goods, and the servant of your holiness, having been granted this experience of God's love and compassion to mankind, and having received His grace—unworthy though I am of every grace—I cannot bear to hide it alone in the bosom of my soul, but I tell the gifts of God to you all, my brethren and fathers, and reveal to you, as far as it is in my power, what is that talent which has been given to me. And through my words I reveal it, as on the palm of my hand. And I say it not as in a hole and a corner, or in secret, but shout out with a loud voice, 'Run, brethren, run!' And not only do I shout, but also point to the charitable Master, stretching out my words instead of a finger.[39] . . . And what marvels of God have I seen and known in reality and experience, I cannot bear to be silent about, but as bearing witness before God I say with a loud voice, 'Run all of you, before the door of penitence is shut upon you by death. . . . Knock, so that the Master may open to you the gates of Paradise before the end of your lives, and manifest Himself to you. Endeavour to acquire consciously the Kingdom of Heaven within yourselves, and depart not empty from hence.'"[40]

St. Symeon again returns in another passage to the Gospel image of the Hidden Treasure: "I shall talk of spiritual things as a madman. I did not shrink to search for the treasure concealed in the Divine Scriptures, and shown to me in a certain place by a holy man. . . . And having left all other work and action of life . . . I did not cease . . . digging . . . until the treasure began to shine on the surface together with the earth. And having worked hard for a long time removing the earth, I saw the whole treasure, which formerly was somewhere down below, spread now above on the surface, and cleansed, as I think, of all earth and filth. And seeing this, I always shout and call to all who disbelieve and do not want to dig: 'Come, learn that not only in the future, but already now, the ineffable treasure which is above all principality and power, lies before your eyes at your feet. Come, be persuaded that that treasure is the Light of the World.'"[41] And here we come to one of the most important moments of the whole mystical development of St. Symeon the New Theologian. He begins to feel without doubt that it is not he who is calling, but Christ Himself, who is the Treasure, is calling to men through him. "And it is not I," he continues, "who am talking of myself, but the Treasure Himself tells it, and is saying, 'I am the Resurrection and the Life: I am the grain of mustard-seed hidden deep in the earth: I am the pearl which is bought by the faithful. . . . And even as I am now seen by those who have sought for me and found me, so shall I shine in them and over them all, as I am now shining, who am hidden and above all heavens. And I, who by nature am uncontainable, here become contained in you by grace, and I the invisible become visible . . . I am the spiritual Paradise, which I became for my servants' sake in place of the Paradise of sense. And into it I introduce all who believe in me and are regenerated by the Spirit. . . . I am

[39] Cat. 34, 34–53. All this passage is entirely omitted by Dionysios Zagoraios in his translation!

[40] Cat. 34, 63–71.

[41] Cat. 34, 251–274.

the luminous source of the immortal stream where those who love me from the depths of their soul bathe in the water that flows from me, not only after death, but at every hour, and are cleansed from all filth of body and soul, and shine like lamps, or like a kind of sunbeam.' . . . But why am I forced," St. Symeon suddenly interrupts himself, "to tell your love all that God, thirsting for our salvation, speaks to us so clearly?" [42]

Such, very briefly sketched, is the mystical way of St. Symeon the New Theologian, as he confesses and describes it in his "Catechetical Orations." From a vision of Divine Light which overshadowed him as a sudden gift of God when he was a young man inexperienced in spiritual life; then, after long years of relaxation and dissipated life in the world, from which he was "dragged by the hair" by Christ Himself, through a long period of ascetic effort in the monastery under the guidance of his beloved spiritual father, St. Symeon the Studite, through abnegation of his will, humility, and above all ardent and continuous prayer to God for the recovery of his spiritual sight; to an interior purification and new mystical illumination, visions of Light, and, as a culminating point, personal contact, knowledge, and communion with Christ, who revealed Himself to St. Symeon speaking to him mystically in his heart through the Holy Spirit, and making it all Light; and after this revelation, the impossibility of hiding the treasure, who is Christ Himself, and the necessity to preach it to all his fellow-creatures, like a brother-loving poor man, who when he receives a coin does not hide it, but runs to his fellows and shouts to them, "Come, here is a merciful man, who gives his coins to everyone"; and when they disbelieve him, he opens his palm and shows the coin in it. This striking picture of the poor man who loves his brethren, who received from Christ the golden coin of grace, who received in his heart Christ Himself, and calls everybody to run and look for the Merciful One who dispenses these golden coins, remains the best image of the holy and attractive personality of St. Symeon the New Theologian, and of his mystical way and teaching. And as he says himself, his writings, his sermons and hymns are really those "palms" on which he shows to everybody who doubts the possibility of mystical revelation and personal communion with Christ during this life, the golden coins of his own spiritual illuminations.

Hieromonk Basil Krivocheine.

Oxford, July, 1953.

A HESYCHAST IN THE MAKING

(concluded)

[In this final instalment of the letters of Varsanuphius to John of Beersheba, we learn something of the latter's trials and stumblings after entering the "hesychastic" cell. The series ends, abruptly but appropriately, with a counsel of silence.]

XXXVII. A Christ-loving man in the world sent asking the same Abba John about a matter, and he gave him an answer. Then he repented of it, and informed the Great Old Man saying, "Forgive me, for I am drunk, and do not know what I am doing."

[42] Cat. 34, 275–312 (abbreviated).

Answer:—

How often I tell thee, "*Let the dead bury their dead*"![1] And not even yet does their evil smell disgust thee? Look what thou art saying. For thou knowest not what thou art saying. For he who is drunk is scoffed at by men, is beaten, is despised, does not hold himself of account, does not offer opinions, or teach others, or give advice about anything, or make distinction that this is good or this bad. And if thou sayest one thing with thy mouth, and showest others in thy works, thou art speaking in ignorance. Do not go to sleep, lest there come suddenly into thine ears, "*Behold, the bridegroom cometh: go ye out to meet him*"[2]—and where then will be thy "I am busy"? He has made thee care-free, and thou willest it not. He has taken away thy worry, and dost thou entangle thyself? He has given thee rest, and wouldest thou be in toils? Time waits not for thee to mourn and weep for thy sins. Remember that he said to thee about the door that it will be shut. Make haste, that thou remain not outside with the foolish virgins. Pass over in thy thought from this vain life unto the other world. Leave earthly things, and seek the heavenly. Relinquish the corruptible, and thou findest the incorruptible. Flee in thy mind from things temporal, and thou comest to the things eternal. Die completely, that thou mayest live completely, in Christ Jesus our Lord.

XXXVIII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he was desirous to receive answer from him frequently for succour and salvation of his soul, and was seeking to learn whether he ought to hold converse with any of the brethren, or be questioned by them about thoughts:—

It is because I know to whom I have committed thee, and what food I have set before thee, that I am not frequent in writing to thee. For He to whom I have committed thee, *knoweth what things thou hast need of before thou askest him.*[3] As thou has heard therefore, be care-free. For to be care-free from every matter makes thee to draw near to the City. And not to be accounted of among men, makes thee to dwell in the City. And to die from every man, makes thee to inherit the City and the Treasures. And since thou art always wanting to hear often the same word about converse with the brethren, or about their thoughts—when need arises, I will tell thee what to do. Do thou therefore have thought for nothing save to accomplish thy journey. I greet thy love unceasingly. And thou mayest learn of thy progress from the gradual quenching in thee of the motion of dreadful wrath. Peace shall be unto thee, my brother and beloved John.

XXXIX. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the same when he wished to cut out converse even with his own attendant, because of what he had been told. that "To be care-free makes thee to draw near to the City"; and to his thought seeking out the causes of the temptations that in divers ways rose up against him:—

Tell the brother—Wait a little longer. For it is not time yet. For indeed

[1] **Matt. viii. 22.**
[2] **Matt. xxv. 6.**
[3] **Matt. vi. 8.**

I take thought for thee more than thou dost thyself—or rather, it is God who takes thought for thee. Brother John, fear nothing from the temptations that rise up against thee for thy proving. For the Lord gives thee not over unto them. When therefore any such thing comes upon thee, weary not thyself in investigating matters, but cry out the name of Jesus, saying, "Jesus, help me," and He hears. For He *is nigh unto all them that call upon Him.*[4] Be not faint-hearted, but run readily, and thou shalt obtain, in Christ Jesus our Lord.

XL. Question of the Same to the same Great Old Man, whether he ought to teach his own attendant rope-making: and about a certain brother who had asked about his own thoughts not clearly but by riddles—whether he had done well.

Answer:—

The bright teaching of our Saviour is this—"*Thy will be done.*"[5] If therefore any one says this prayer with sincerity, he dissolves his own will, and hangs everything on the will of God. So to teach the brother is profitable; but the matter has occasion of envy. But it can be done at rare intervals, once and again, and the matter be veiled for the sake of the conscience of the brethren. But about questioning in riddles—it is an individualism, showing lack of discernment, and such a one has need of many prayers. For *signs* are *not for the faithful, but for the unbelieving.*[6]

XLI. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he had fallen into many thoughts and worries about the constitution of the monastery:—

Many are the things which bubble in thy heart. And it says, "*If I should count them, they are more in number than the sand.*"[7] Brother, no one knows to what this place will be coming, save only God the knower of hearts. And He has assured me. Have it, then, that the Lord will not forsake it, but keep and glorify it to the glory of His glorious name. Unto Him be the glory unto the ages. Amen. Henceforth be care-free, and live in quiet. For all things come in their time and order.

XLII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the same when he questioned him about the sickness that had come upon him, whence it was; and whether he ought to tell the brethren who were going off to Egypt how to act: and when he was anxious about them, lest they should have trouble from their inexperience of the places:—

Tell the brother—Those that are with thee are mixed, from Egypt and from Jerusalem. But do not be worried: for God has care for thee. And do what is in thine heart in the fear of God: and be not troubled for the brethren, but only pray, and the Lord will guide them according to His will concerning every matter. For nothing happens without God, especially in this place, if it is according to the fear of God for refreshment and profit of souls.

[4] Ps. cxlv. (cxliv.) 18.
[5] Matt. vi. 10.
[6] 1 Cor. xiv. 22.
[7] Ps. cxxxix. (cxxxviii.) 18.

XLIII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same, so that he should offer up all his concerns to God:—

If any drinketh of the water that I have sent thee by letters, *he shall never thirst.*[8] But thou oughtest to expect and to hope for refreshment by the faith of Christ. Take this bread from my food, and be care-free. Fear nothing, but receive power and hope through the Holy Spirit. Believe that the hand of God is with thee.

XLIV. From the "blessing"[9] *sent him, he gave to his attendant, not from his own hand, because he was not of the clergy, but he put it down, and the attendant took it for himself. And when he received a "blessing" a second and a third time, he did the same. And doing this without permission, he did not notice the sin. And again, when he saw that by the Old Mans' prayers he had been relieved of the passions, he said, "The passions are relaxed from me." After this he sent questioning about a thought of blasphemy, and did not receive an answer. And while he was wondering what the cause of this was, suddenly by permission of God, for his admonition, there appeared to him a fearful apparition both once and again, and immediately departed. And being filled with much turmoil and vexation, he remembered the sin of the bread only, forgetting what he had said at the relaxation of the passions. And he put on the cowl which had of old been sent him by the Old Man, and prostrated himself many times praying that he might receive mercy. And the Old Man wrote to him about the two faults, and also about the thought of blasphemy, and saying that to put down the "blessings" for the attendant to take for himself was not humility, but rather swelling pride, and the act of a childish mind:—*

If a man knows that he transgresses the commandment, he shows one evidence of knowledge. And he who knows is corrected. But we speak simply, as we may. I have set thee in the hand of God, and thou turnest aside therefrom. And the Scripture says that the righteous *turn not aside from the mouth of God.*[10] How thinkest thou? Shall I speak? And again it says, *"And let not arrogancy come out of your mouth."*[11] And thou daredst to open thy mouth before God and say, "The passions are relaxed from me," and didst not rather say, "They are all lying in me as in store." For this wast thou forsaken for a little, and all thy wretchedness appeared: and were it not for the covering that thou hast, thou wouldest surely have had hard labour. But *"God is faithful,"* it says, *"who will not suffer* us *to be tempted above that* we *are able, but will with the temptation make also the way of escape, that* we *may be able to bear it."*[12] And to do a thing untimely comes of our own will. To be puffed up, not having ordination, and to give to others a *blessing* like an archbishop—I know not how I shall express this. What then? Did I not know how to send *blessings* to all, or

[8] John iv. 14.
[9] "εὐλογία"—an object (often a loaf) sent or given in token of blessing.
[10] Prov. xxiv. 7.
[11] 1 Sam. ii. 3.
[12] 1 Cor. x. 13.

did I send them specially to thee? Behold, then, thou hast been a little admonished for many great faults. Be sober henceforth firmly to destroy the eight alien nations, and do not sit down being dragged along with childish matters. And gain strictness, which is simplicity. For often thou hast heard, "*Do all things with counsel.*"[13] And concerning every passion and blasphemy, pray God, and He will help thee, and drive them from thee little by little. And be sober for the future, and keep these things in thy heart. And there is no need that any should learn of it. But what has happened has happened. Therefore—Jesus shall be with thee. Forgive me what is past, and I will put right what is to come, unto the ages. Amen.

XLV. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when, falling into a great sickness, and being held with a vehement fever, and having had neither food nor sleep for many days, he cried out in insult against the Abbot and the brethren who were attending him, the devil working in him:—

O brother, how is thy heart become as water, to leave the Beloved and run after the enemy! Thou hast left the voice of the Shepherd Christ, and hast followed after the wolf, the devil. What has happened to thee? What hast thou endured? What are these clamours which the Apostle numbered among ill-spoken things when he said, "*Let all clamour and blasphemy and wrath be taken away from you, with all malice*"?[14] Thou hast suffered nothing beyond thy power, as the Apostle cries aloud, "*God is faithful, who will not suffer* us *to be tempted above that* we *are able,*" etc. Wake up from this vexation of bad thoughts, and take the rod of the Cross, wherewith thou wilt drive away the wolves, that is, the demons; and remember to say, "*Why art thou so vexed, O my soul, and why art thou so disquieted within me? Hope thou in God, for I will yet give him thanks, which is the health of my countenance, and my God.*"[15] Be sober for the future, and do not flare up like a foolish boy who has no perception. When thou art indebted to mount the Cross with Christ, and to be nailed with the nails, and to be pierced with the spear, what has come upon thee, poor wretch, that thou criest out against Christ of force, and insultest thy brethren? Where is the saying of the Apostle, "*In honour, preferring one another*"?[16] So far is enough. For it says, "*Give occasion to a wise man, and he will be wiser,*"[17] Bear, and be quiet, and give thanks for all things. For so it says, "*In everything give thanks*"[18]—clearly, both *in necessities* and *in afflictions*[19] and in sicknesses, and in reliefs. Therefore hold to God, and He will remain with thee, and give thee power in His name. For unto Him is the glory unto the ages.

XLVI. When he had been relieved of the sickness, and come back to soberness from the temptation, the adversary showed him evil dreams, so as to vex him again. And failing of this, again he showed him as it

[13] Prov. xxxi. 4. (LXX, xxiv. 72.)
[14] Eph. iv. 31.
[15] Ps. xliii. (xlii.) 5.
[16] Rom. xii. 10.
[17] Prov. ix. 9.
[18] 1 Thess. v. 18.
[19] 2 Cor. vi. 4.

were a monastery and a Church, and many taking refuge there to obtain help—as it seemed. And the Old Man, making him sure, wrote to him thus:—

Glory to God in the highest,[20] brother. Our enemy *the devil* is ranged *as a lion roaring to devour*[21] thee. But the hand of God which always is spread over us did not let him. So when he saw that he is not permitted to do anything of what he desires, he set himself to vex thy wits, and showed thee some matters beforehand by his shameful dreams. And like a wicked man in his crattiness, when he saw that the Lord is not giving thee over to be tried unto the end, or beyond thy power, he made thee see a Church and a monastery, as it seemed, of help. Do thou then make sure thy heart, sealing it without vexation in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and I believe that He will help us to tread down his head. Therefore obtain a humble heart, and give glory to Him who saved thee from the snare of death. For it is of negligence that this has come upon thee.

XLVII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same, when he had fallen into warfare set up by divers thoughts, which was very grievous and to most people incomprehensible:—

Say to brother John—I wonder at thy love how thou dost not understand these matters. For I, seeing thy afflictions to be many, have often sent thee from myself a *blessing*, that thou by means of these mightest receive power according to God. But thou oughtest to meditate always the 106th Psalm, from where it says, "*At his word the stormy wind ariseth, which lifteth up the waves thereof. They are carried up to the heavens, and down again to the deep*"; and again, "*Their soul melteth away because of the trouble.*"[22] These things have come upon us, and we ought to endure such dangers, until we attain *unto the haven of His will*,[23] even as I have written to thee before. For the rest, God has not *given* thee *over into the hands of* thine *enemies*, and do not thou give thyself into their hands: And if thus thou doest, God will not give thee over. But wouldest thou be delivered from the afflictions and not grow weary in them? Expect worse, and thou wilt find rest. Remember Job, and all the Saints from him on, how great afflictions they endured: and obtain their patience, and thy spirit will be comforted. *Play the man and be strong*,[24] and pray for me, remembering my words, and my soul is renewed.

XLVIII. When for some reason the Abbot was slow in bringing him the above reply, he accused him vehemently, and put him in great disheartenment. And when some of the brethren who were being tended for sickness told him about some matters, saying that they were being done idly and unprofitably in the Coenobium, instead of admonishing and correcting them for such slander, he said he also was not pleased with these things. And when the Abbot afterwards told him, "These

[20] Luke ii. 14.
[21] 1 Peter v. 8.
[22] Ps. cvii. (cvi.) 25–6.
[23] Ibid., 30.
[24] Deut. xxxi. 6, etc.

things also I did according to the decision of the Old Man," he said to him, "The Old Man lets thee walk according to thine own will." And at this the Old Man sent him this reply, signifying to him, "The things which you think are not being done right are being done 'by œconomy,' being beyond our apprehension":—

Again, after so long, love rouses us to cudgel thee with Christ's rod of chastening and rebuke, that in us also the word of Scripture may be fulfilled which says, "*More faithful are the wounds of a friend,*"[25] etc. And again if we chasten thee, faint not, but remember the proverb which says, "*My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art reproved of him: for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.*"[26] But even if I rebuke thee, thou art not ignorant how the Apostle says, "*Reprove, rebuke, exhort.*"[27] Where is thy mind, thou slothful? Or where dwells thy thought, thou sluggard? Why do the lords of thy mind gainsay in thee the Disciples of the Master, that they should not take it for the Master to mount thereon, that He may enter into Jerusalem, and *cast out from* the Temple of God *those that sell and buy*,[28] and put to shame the Scribes and Pharisees? Why, when thou oughtest to be dwelling in Jerusalem, do they drag thee off to Babylon? Why dost thou leave the water of Siloam, and desirest to drink of the troubled waters of the Egyptians? Why dost thou go aside from the way of humility which says, "*Who am I? I am dust and ashes,*"[29] and desirest to walk in the perverse way which is full of afflictions and dangers? Where hast thou cast my words which I have spoken to thee night and day? Where is what I tell thee, speaking as if to myself, where to arrive? And where dost thou see thyself arriving? Where do I want thee to be, and where art thou, because thou hast thy tongue uncontrolled, and lettest it go at random? And if thou givest thought to thy neighbour, art thou not scrupulous to understand, especially when it is he who after God protects us, and lays down his own neck for us; whom we ought to thank, and pray for him that he may be kept from every evil, for profit of us and of many, learning this from the holy Apostle, how giving thanks he said concerning some, "*Who for my sake laid down their own necks*"?[30] What then dost thou not remember? The freedom from care which God has given thee through him? The sitting whereof thou partakest in quiet like a king, while he bears the weight of those who come to us and go away, and he makes us undisturbed? For if it is because of us they come, we ought to bear their care, and not he. So then we owe great thanks to God who gave us a true son after our own soul, as he desired. And instead of this thou hast told him senselessly, "I have washed my hands of thee"; and that not once, but often, drowning his soul in much sorrow, and hast not remembered how the Apostle said, "*Lest such a one should be swallowed up with*

[25] Prov. xxvii. 6.
[26] Prov. iii. 11–12.
[27] 2 Tim. iv. 2.
[28] Matt. xxi. 1–13, etc. Note that in Greek one letter transforms "Of thy mind" (νοῦ) into "Of thine ass" (ὄνου).
[29] Gen. xviii. 27, etc.
[30] Rom. xvi. 4.

overmuch sorrow."[31] And had it not been for the hand of God, and the prayer of his fathers, his heart must have been broken. Where are my commandments to thee, "Weep, mourn, seek not to be accounted of, and in nothing measure thyself?" Unto another way I draw thy love. Pass over from the world, mount now the Cross. Be lightened from the earth. *Shake off the dust from off thy feet.*[32] Join not with the Chaldeans in kindling the furnace, that thou be not burnt up with them by the wrath of God. Hold every man as *exceeding thyself.*[33] Weep for thy dead body. *Cast out thy beam.*[34] Build up thy house that has been distorted. Cry, "*Have mercy on me, thou Son of David, that I may receive my sight.*"[35] Learn, "*That every mouth may be stopped.*"[36] *Speak not proudly.*[37] *Shut thy door* against the enemy:[38] *Set thy words in the balance, and make for thy door a bar.*[39] Thou knowest how I speak to thee. Understand the things I say. Toil to follow them exactly, and thou wilt find the treasures hidden therein according to God. Bring forth in them fruits worthy of God, and do not put to shame my grey hairs when I am praying for thee day and night. May the Lord give thee to understand and to do in His fear. Amen.

And since thou hast said to him, "The Old Man lets thee walk according to thine own will"—then it is I who am bearing alone the judgment which the Lord spake by the prophet, "If thou see thy brother walking in a way that is not good, and say not to him that this way is evil, *his blood will I require at thy hand.*"[40] Be not mocked, but believe the Apostle when he says that we *shall give account on his behalf.*[41] But ye do not understand what it is that is happening.

XLIX. Thanking the Old Man for the correction, he asked him to write to him often about the salvation of his soul. Likewise also about a thought which he was seeking to tell the Abbot, he asked the Old Man to tell him:

Answer:—

Brother John, what this is I know not. Thou hast been written to from Alpha to Omega, from the condition of a novice to full growth, from the beginning of the way to its end, from the *putting off the old man with his lusts* to the *putting on the new man which after God is created*[42]; from becoming alien to the land of sense, to becoming a citizen of Heaven, and an inheritor of the mind's *land of promise.* Ruminate on the letters, and thou wilt be saved. For thou hast in them, if thou understandest, both the Old and the New Testament. And understanding them, thou hast no need of any other book. Shake off forgetfulness and leave the darkness, and all

[31] 2 Cor. ii. 7.
[32] Matt. x. 14.
[33] Phil. ii. 3.
[34] Matt. vii. 5.
[35] Mark x. 48, 51.
[36] Rom. iii. 19.
[37] Ob. i. 12.
[38] Isa. xxvi. 20.
[39] Ecclus. xxviii. 25.
[40] Ezek. iii. 18, etc.
[41] Rom. xiv. 12; Heb. xiii. 17.
[42] Eph. iv. 22–4; Col. iii. 9–10.

these things shall come to thee. The smoke of the idol-sacrifices shall fail from thy mind's Niniveh, and the odour of the incense of spiritual repentance shall be spread abroad in her streets, and prevent the wrath which was threatening unto destruction. Where art thou slumbering? Why hast thou cast under thy head the answers that were for thy salvation, and indeed also for salvation of all who with faith study them? Cease from thy dreams now: wake from thy deep sleep: speed up thy feet: attain to Zoar, that the overthrow of the five cities overtake thee not. And turn not backwards, that thou become not a pillar of salt. And become *wise like the serpent*, that thine enemies may not lead thee astray; but *harmless like the doves*,[43] that the requital may not make war upon thee. Become a true servant of one master, since else thou must be enslaved unto many. Separate not thyself from him. For the unfaithful received for this the sentence. Look how thou sittest. Say to thyself, "Why am I sitting thus? What have I gained from this sitting?" And the loving-kind God will enlighten thy heart to understand. Behold for the present He has made thee care-free from every earthly worry. Give heed to thyself, and look where thou art, and what thou desirest, and God will help thee in all things, my brother. And about the thought of which thou spakest, to tell to my son—yes, I could tell him: but if thou tellest him not thyself with thy own mouth, thou estrangest thyself from true and perfect love towards him. If ye are one soul and one heart, according to the Scripture, no man hides anything from his own heart. Get understanding, thou who art still dull of heart. The Lord will forgive thee.

L. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he asked whether he ought after the Holy Great Week no longer to have converse with any:—

After the Feast, be in quiet five days in the week, and two days meet with others as necessity arises. And again I say to thee what thou must do. But do what thou canst to be care-free from every matter. For God makes provision for every man for the best, whether by pricking his heart, or by awakening him by means of another for profit.

LI. After the Feast a bishop came and sought to have converse with him. Some novices also wanted to question him about thoughts. And he sent to question the same Great Old Man about this:—

Answer:—

Thou knowest that we have never set a bond upon any, not even on ourselves. And since I told thee, "Be in quiet five days in the week, and on two days hold converse"—be care-free from this also, and hold converse when I told thee. And when thou holdest converse, be care-free what thou sayest, or what thou shalt speak. For Christ said, *"It is the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you."*[44] But about the brethren of whom thou spakest—when necessity arises, do not refuse: and God will help thee. Amen.

[43] Matt. x. 16.
[44] Matt. x. 20.

LII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he spoke about the unsettled condition of the world:—

Brother, while we have time let us give heed to ourselves: for all things are in confusion. And let us train ourselves to silence. And if thou wilt have rest in all things, become dead from every man, and thou wilt have rest. Note that about thoughts, and about every matter and conduct and worry I say to thee, "Be *quiet* in peace."

LIII. After this answer, he sought to cut off converse completely. And one brother was very much troubled at this, and besought him that he would have converse with him if need arose. And he had compassion, and promised. And he asked about this; and about a cowl sent him by a brother, whether he ought to accept it:—

Answer:—

Brother, I sent thee word, "Be care-free." What wilt thou? Give heed to thyself. *The harvest is great.*[45] Do not leave it, and set thyself to glean grapes after the gatherers. But do thou leave all, and give thy time to harvesting and gathering, that thou mayest have thy fruits of corn and wine and oil, that thy heart may be established and made glad in the Lord. Meditate upon the letters that I have written thee: for they are not idle. But as to the cowl—if the brother desire to give it thee with all his heart, accept it, condemning thyself as unworthy.

LIV. A brother having grievous warfare, and being ashamed to make bold of it to the Abbot, sent beseeching the same Abba John to receive him without the Abbot's knowing, and to hear his thought. But Abba John was troubled in two ways, not wanting to receive him without permission, lest he should cause scandal to the others, and at the same time not wanting to grieve him. And being at a loss what to do, he questioned mentally the same Great Old Man, asking also whether he must block his own door:—

Answer:—

Say to the brother—Who is without understanding, to choose for himself the thing that brings loss and is more troublesome, and not that which is lighter and more easily endured, with humility and prayer? Block not thy door. For mortification is not in the blocking of the door but in the blocking of the mouth. I salute thee with an holy kiss.

REVIEW

PETAR PETROVIĆ NJEGOŠ: *THE RAYS OF MICROCOSM*, translated by Professor Clarence A. Manning, with a foreword by Bishop Nikolai: München, Library SVECHANIK, 1953: 87 pp.

This is a long-expected translation of Prince-Bishop Njegoš's most profound philosophico-religious poem, reminiscent of Milton's "Paradise Lost," though quite originally conceived and planned. Professor Manning has attempted to fill an important gap.

[45] Matt. ix. 37.

Prince-Bishop Njegoš of Montenegro (1813–51), the greatest Serbian poet and thinker, became ruler of his small, and *de jure* still not independent, country at the age of seventeen. Three years later, with his consecration as Archbishop of Montenegro, he became ecclesiastical prince as well. Njegoš's life was one of manifold worries and anxieties; for twenty years he was struggling against tremendous odds, internal and external, to preserve both the physical existence and the spiritual independence of his country. Though self-educated, Njegoš was a prominent man of letters, and a born poet. Small wonder, then, that he felt deeply the onus of his peculiarly tragic predicament, summed up in the words, "I am a ruler among barbarians, and a barbarian among rulers." His best poems are LUČA MIKROKOZMA, now under review; GORSKI VIJENAC, translated into English and published under the title "THE MOUNTAIN WREATH" in 1930 (two editions); and THE FALSE TZAR STEFAN THE SMALL, still untranslated. Njegoš's poetic mastery remains unsurpassed in his country. It was of this extraordinary Prince-Bishop that an Anglican scholar wrote that he was "at once the leader of his people in war, their priest and bishop in peace, their instructor, their judge, and the bard to whose poems they listened and still listen with delight." [1]

Worn out by his arduous and unsparing work for the welfare of his people, Njegoš died from consumption at the age of 38.

What is the subject of the poem under review? Its central theme is human destiny; its inspiration, Njegoš's fervent religious mysticism. Njegoš, for whom poetic intuition was the highest form of knowledge, taught that the first man, Adam, was an angel, in rank inferior only to three archangels, Michael, Gabriel, and Satan. When Satan, however, decided to fight against God's *monarchy*, and for a *dyarchy*, Adam and all his legion sided with Satan. The heavenly war starts, and some wonderful descriptions of it are given in the poem. But on the third day of the fight, Adam withdrew from it, in consequence of a dreadful vision in which he was given to see the destiny of his legion. Satan and his angels are eventually defeated and banished into hell. Adam for his timely repentance, and by gracious intervention of the Word of God, is not condemned to hell, but to an earthly life instead. The earth is created for that purpose, and Adam and his legion are sent, with their newly-acquired bodies, down to it for a temporary expiation. In Eden, we find Adam and Eve very much as in the Bible. Njegoš does not tell us what happened to the rest of the legion, but seems to think that they would be sent into bodies in their turn, with the birth of new men.

The central theme of the poem is that the human soul is immortal, a divine spark by its origin, returning to its heavenly abode after death. It is on this earth that men have to make their final decision which side to join—God's or Satan's—the latter being still powerful, with unlimited control over hell, and almost unlimited in the world of men. Here Njegoš was trying ingeniously to reconcile Christian belief in an all-good God with the empirical evil and its attendant suffering: God is not the cause of evil; still less is He to blame for its existence: evil came into the world through

[1] W. Denton, *Montenegro*, p. 272.

the fall of our ancestors: free spirits brought it about in the very heaven. In keeping with this theory, there are according to Njegoš two original sins —one in angelic pre-existence, when evil was born, and the other in Eden, when it was confirmed: for it is this latter fall which still further lowered human dignity, and made universal salvation and restoration far more difficult: for it is only after this second original sin that wicked men willingly decide to join Satan in hell, identifying their ultimate destiny with his. This is but one of a number of points, including that of human creation, which show clearly that Njegoš is far from being strictly dogmatic, as an Orthodox bishop would naturally be expected to be. But in spite of such heterodoxies, the poem is a religious poem *par excellence*, one of the most spiritual poems ever to appear in the Serbian language. "It is all spirit, religion, and dramatic victory of God over Satan," as Bishop Nikolai says in his Foreword.

The poem itself begins with a philosophical dedication to Sima Milutinovič, Njegoš's private tutor, which admirably sums up the poet's philosophy of life. There follow six cantos describing the whole tragedy of man's double fall. The poem numbers in all 2,210 lines.

The translation itself is pleasing in some ways. Professor Manning deserves full credit for his attempt. A number of passages are in fact extremely well translated, almost giving the impression that they might have been written by Njegoš himself, in English. For instance:—

"The distance from the world on which we sat
To heaven where was placed the throne of God
Was vast and great, a hundred times as great
As from the earth unto far Uranus;
The whole expanse, as far as I could see,
Was but a world, and it was filled with worlds,
And each one had its own bright shining sphere." [2]

(Njegoš can see these heavenly beauties from a cosmic viewpoint, after he has travelled through six moving and five immoveable heavens.)

Or again:—

"I turn my gaze again around the sight
And mark what lies upon the heavenly plains;
My eyes are drowned in all the beauty there;
My tongue grows mute from all the wonders too.
Who can, O God, have knowledge of thy ways,
Or picture e'en the power that thou hast?" [3]

Translation of lines like these is fairly correct, often rhythmical, and on the whole pleasing, giving the feel of Njegoš's poetic genius and sincerity of belief. Alas, such lines are all too rare. I myself, in making a translation of 1,800 lines, have not been able to retain more than sixteen in Professor Manning's rendering.

This does not, of course, mean that all the rest is wholly or consistently bad. But, with due allowance to the translator, his work is inadequate and exasperating in many ways. In the first place, it is crammed with mis-

[2] *The Rays of Microcosm*, p. 25.
[3] Ibid., p. 30.

translations, distortions, even naïve misreadings. It seems incredible that the line

"Lica tame nigdje bilo nije"

should be rendered

"But *there* was not a *person* to be seen." [4]

Bishop Njegoš is saying that, at that particular point of the cosmic drama, "there was not even an *appearance of darkness*." Professor Manning appears to have translated the Russian adverb "Tam" (there) in place of the Serbian word for darkness (gen. "Tame")! Njegoš's subtle point is hopelessly ruined.

One could not, in a short review, give at length all the cases where the meaning of the lines has either been transformed or completely lost. Two examples, taken at random, must suffice:—

(a) The angel Adam had just finished relating to his followers his vision of the impending disaster. The lines describing the effect on the hearers are thus given by Professor Manning:—

"From the great mass of this confused throng
When they had lost the hopes they once had had
And saw themselves retreating from the grave,
The troops seemed sad that followed Adam still." [5]

Has Professor Manning been trying unsuccessfully to improve on Njegoš's fine comparison? For here is what Njegoš wants to say:—

"The regiments still supporting Adam looked like a family great in number returning mournfully from the graveyard, sadly bereft of its bright hope."

(b) Another example, no less distressing. Njegoš is describing Satan's slender chances in his fight against the Almighty. Here is Professor Manning's rendering:—

"The wretched men who sail upon the sea
Will land, despite the sinking of their ship,
Far out upon the stormy ocean wave,
When once the sun appears to mend their woes
And bring them hope for finding safety too,
Before you grasp the sun with eager hands
And drive the Lord from His almighty throne." [6]

Again, all the elements are there, but so broken up and reassembled as to lose completely Njegoš's meaning, which is this:—

"The wretched men sailing over the sea who, having suffered shipwreck right in the midst of the stormy ocean, turn towards the rising sun, soliciting their salvation from it—they might sooner grasp the sun with their hands, than you become rulers of the almighty throne."

There are many more passages—stanzas, and even whole pages—similarly misrendered. Even in the title of the poem, for "Luča," there seems no reason why "Rays" should have been substituted for the simple and literal rendering "Light." (We would not here stress evidence of inadequate

[4] Ibid., p. 55.
[5] Ibid., p. 65.
[6] Ibid., p. 61.

proof-reading in misprints and omissions even of whole lines.) With deep sorrow I must say that the work has been inadequately done. In its literary and intellectual character, the poem has been mutilated, and does no credit in this form to Bishop Njegoš, having been made in many places utter unintelligible nonsense. For the same reason I find it difficult to endorse Bishop Nikolai's commendation that the translation is "on the whole clear and well done." "*Amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas.*" It is neither clear, except here and there, nor well done. Having been working now for two years on Bishop Njegoš's religious philosophy, I was delighted to hear of the appearance of this English translation of *Luča Mikrokozma*, one of the main sources for such a study. My joy was short-lived. Now I am wondering whether it would not have been better if the great Montenegrin bard had remained as yet buried in the obscurity of the Balkans.

ŽIKA RAD. PRVULOVIČ.

CORRESPONDENCE

65 Rue Lauriston, Paris 16, France.
October 13th, 1953.

Dear Mr. Editor,

As one of the secretaries of "Syndesmos," the newly-founded organization for co-ordination among the existing movements or groups of Orthodox Young People, I am sincerely grateful to *The Christian East* for having shown such a great interest in our first general Conference at Sèvres, near Paris (Easter, 1953). The author of the article dealing with that subject is one of the "pillars" of our work in England and his opinions of our Conference are of the greatest interest. But, at the same time, as an average member of the Sèvres meeting, I must confess that my general impression of it is not exactly the same as that of Father Rodzianko. I do not remember that the problem of ecclesiastical jurisdiction had such an importance at Sèvres. It seems to me that Father Vladimir has the subjective impression that this problem was the centre of all discussions at Sèvres. On the other hand, another criticism of our meeting, which criticism seems to me just as subjective, asserts that this problem was consciously *avoided* at Sèvres ("Dans l'Esprit et la Vérité," Avril-Mai, 1953, Nos. 16–17)![1]

In giving his impression of the Conference, Father Rodzianko criticizes one particular position in regard to the problem of Orthodox jurisdictions in Western Europe: the ". . . conclusion that the territorial principle was essential to Orthodoxy, and that diverse nationalities and authorities cannot affect this principle." The author admits that "this conclusion was not explicitly stated in the lecture, but was made abundantly clear in the discussion." Still he reopens a debate on this question and sees here a "one-sided enthusiasm for a certain truth," a "danger of error," an "ecclesiological monophysitism," a "peculiar idealism which does not or will not see the contemporary human problems of the Church as they really are," etc.

[1] The criticism in this periodical was in the form of a question: "Pourquoi a-t-on voulu ignorer, jusque dans la formulation des statuts (provisoires) le fait des juridictions?"—ED.

I was not present at the discussion on this topic, which discussion occurred only in the group of Father Vladimir and not at the plenary meeting, but I take the occasion of Father Vladimir's article to confess my belief that there is a real ecclesiological problem involved here, which *must* be solved by our common ecclesiastical conscience in a Christian way.

First of all, it is clear to me that this problem cannot be treated on the level of the existing conflicts among Patriarchates, but on the contrary must be treated on the level of the concrete Orthodox life and witness in the West. The "contemporary human problem of the Orthodox Church" in the West is that of its division, its lack of common consciousness. One can try to find different ways of creating a kind of common life, but I strongly believe that the tradition of the Church and an explicit canonical "consensus" give us the *normal* solution, based upon the principle that the Orthodox Christians, since they are *one* in Christ, must live in ecclesiastical and hierarchical unity, wherever they are, because for them, there is no other possible unity than that of Christ and no other kind of unity in Christ than that of the Church, with all its hierarchical order. We must bear in mind that there was practically no exception to that norm before 1920! And there is certainly a possibility of maintaining in a normal ecclesiastical order all the national customs and distinctions characterizing this or that historical tradition. Can we really and seriously say that an "ecclesiastical monophysitism" is here involved? And can the "human elements," i.e. nationalism, which are undoubtedly what Saint Paul had to fight against in the Church of Corinth, modify the norm?

It is true that the Church had always to deal with these "human elements," and this "dealing" received the name of "economy." But economy never becomes the norm, being in its very essence an exception to the norm. And certainly, if the present situation of the Orthodox Church in Western Europe can be tolerated, it is surely by economy. But an absolutization of this situation would certainly lead to ecclesiastical liberalism, to a "modern Church," going "with our time" and our "human problems." Actually, in Western Europe, no jurisdiction can pretend to be the "local" Church, since all jurisdictions have a definite and explicit national character. Any other interpretation of the situation seems to me to be a misunderstanding. But this situation is *recent* and *abnormal*. Perhaps, the Church will find some other solution than the traditional one in order to secure the manifestation of its unity. But there is actually no other way than the traditional; and this of course can be achieved *only* in a conciliar way, on the highest or on the lowest level. Of course, I do not think that an organization such as "Syndesmos" can by itself solve problems of jurisdiction; and that is the reason why these problems were not on the agenda at Sèvres.

Another remark of Father Rodzianko is also certainly due to a misunderstanding. It is not true to say that the "logical conclusion" of the papers read at Sèvres was that "Ecumenism is the only way out for Orthodoxy, which finds itself in it and obtains deliverance so from all its internal troubles!" The readers of the bulletin of our organization will certainly have the opportunity to make up their own minds about it, since all the papers will be published there.

I am sure that all these problems should be and will be discussed again in very broad Orthodox circles. It is always encouraging when such matters are put forth by such persons as Father Vladimir, whose fidelity to the cause of Orthodox unity is obvious and who himself asked me for an answer to his friendly criticism.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN MEYENDORFF.

14a Ladbroke Terrace, London, W. 11,

December 5th, 1953.

My dear Father,

I am very grateful to you indeed for asking me to write a commentary to Mr. Meyendorff's criticism of my article. And I am grateful to him too for such a good and kind letter.

I quite agree with him that we are very often "subjective" in our views (especially when we use such words as "pillars") and that is why I myself like such polemics.

As you know my article was written and published in Russian, and then translated into English at your request. Unfortunately, my words "I may have presented them (the papers) in too simplified a form and too subjectively: *but that was my personal reaction*" (p. 143) are not adequate to the original. In Russian they run: "*but such was the reaction of a hearer,*" which means that I collected it not only from my own personal impression, but from other people too. The following words would be very obscure without such a meaning: "of course, there was not, and could not have been, a 'plot' among the lecturers, *as some people supposed.*"

One of the readers of my article, neither Russian, nor Serbian, who was himself present at Sèvres and is now a member of the "Syndesmos" Committee in Paris, said to me that his impression was exactly the same.

It is true that the questions of jurisdiction were not officially on the agenda, but still there remains a fact, that one of the National Churches in Paris (Serbian) refused at first to be present at the Conference at all because of those ideas—against "nationalism"—which Mr. Meyendorff advocates. Does it not show quite clearly that it was not only I who "subjectively" invented those questions? On the contrary, it was I who had to deal with that Paris business and to ask (fortunately successfully) my Serbian brethren to come and take part in our common work.

Sometimes it is much more dangerous not to speak about certain things, still having them in mind, than to state them openly. I saw that danger in Mr. Meyendorff's paper, and in that respect the critics were quite right: the problem was "consciously avoided"; but unconsciously proclaimed in a one-sided way. When I said that it was made "abundantly clear at the discussion," I did not mean only in my own discussion group, where that problem was very slightly touched. The very fact that Fr. Zenkovsky gave his solution of that problem at the open session, when I did not say a word at all, shows again, quite clearly, that the problem was much more objective than it seems to Mr. Meyendorff.

My critic then proceeds in his letter to the nature of the polemics themselves, openly defending his and his friends' opinion. It proves once more that there was something real in my showing the ideological background of his talk.

It would be necessary to write a special ecclesiological article on the subject if we were going to deal with the matter theoretically. I cannot do it here, and therefore I must not exceed the limits of the practice of the Church.

It is commonly admitted that it would have been much worse for both—the Church and the Apostles—if St. Paul and St. Barnabas had not separated from each other, when they could not go on preaching together. Both having the Divine Grace, they had to take into consideration their common human nature. If they neglected it, the real schism could easily arise. But now they were still in full communion.

That example has nothing to do with the pure canonical problem of "jurisdictions," but it shows the balance between the Divine and the human in the Church in her actual practice.

Speaking on the principle of the "ecclesiastical and hierarchical unity" of the Orthodox Christians "wherever they are," Mr. Meyendorff says that "there was practically no exception to that norm before 1920." I shall remind him only of the history of the Church of Cyprus when it was a refugee Church on the continent: there was a brotherly decision to have the parallel jurisdictions on the same territory.[1] I should be grateful to Mr. Meyendorff if he would find a single word "economy" in connection with that decision—which was quite normal in such circumstances. It was not the "economy"—it was the right of the Cypriot Church.

The real trouble did not start because of the similar decisions after 1920, but because of what happened in 1926 among refugees of the same nationality (Russian) in Europe. Their three different groups, which still exist, each proclaimed in their own way "the only possible canonical norm" for themselves and for everybody else, excluding each other on that ground. "The existing conflicts among Patriarchates" were practically introduced into the life of the Orthodox Church just by those Russians in exile.

But in Yugoslavia, in spite of the fact that there was one of the Russian centres, it was quite different. Even the exiled Russians themselves, in spite of their political quarrels, had no schisms. The wise decision of the Serbian Council of Bishops was to allow the Russians their parallel jurisdiction on Serbian territory, and to accept at the same time individual Russians, if they wanted, into the Serbian Church. As a result, there was never a conflict between the Serbian Patriarchate and any of those Russians—even in the worst days of war, or immediately after it—nor with any other Orthodox Patriarchate—even that of Moscow, in spite of all difficulties and troubles. They all were, and still are, in full communion.

It seems to me that the last, and not the first, is a really Christian and

[1] The Metropolitan and Church of Cyprus took refuge in the Hellespont from Arab invasion just before the Council in Trullo (A.D. 692-3), which dealt with the situation in its 39th Canon. But there are considerable doubts as to the exact historical facts, and the text and meaning of this Canon.—ED.

Orthodox approach to the newly arisen problems of diaspora. The very principle of Orthodox Autocephality itself, I think, came out of the similar approach of the Church to the old problems in the old days.

Mr. Meyendorff's ideas of "ecclesiastical and hierarchical unity" of Orthodox Christians "wherever they are" logically, I am afraid, must lead either directly to Rome, or to provoking schisms and conflicts, as happened in Paris, and—long before—in the Protestant world.

Now, many members of the Protestant sects believe that it is only Ecumenism who can cure them. That is why I said, may be a little exaggerating, that Professor Zander's view on Ecumenism (if I rightly understood him) was a "logical conclusion" of those, who, dreaming of "one jurisdiction," inevitably had to face the problems of "different jurisdictions," consciously avoiding their difficulties at their common conferences in an Ecumenical manner.

Neither of them is an Orthodox ideal!

We have quite recently received the official blessing for "Syndesmos" from the Serbian Patriarch, His Holiness Vikenty, as well as from the Serbian Bishops in USA—The Right Rev. Dionisy and Nikolai. There is no need to say how important this is, both for the Serbian Church in Yugoslavia and in exile, and for all other sister-Churches and for "Syndesmos" itself. But I positively know that the blessing was given only because the questions we are talking of were raised at the open session in Sèvres, and successfully solved by Fr. Zenkovsky's and other people's formulas.

There are encouraging words in Mr. Meyendorff's letter: "In Western Europe no jurisdiction can pretend to be the 'local' Church, since all jurisdictions have a definite and explicit national character." It is a retreat from his own and Fr. Schmemann's previous position, and is not in accordance even with what Fr. Zenkovsky meant. But even if Mr. Meyendorff calls it "economy" it is encouraging, for it shows that we have to accept the "status quo" and to live side by side, in our big foreign cities and countries, in full eucharistic communion and unity with each other, being obedient to our respective hierarchies and leading our church life within our own communities. And that would be the very Orthodox ideal, whether in our different countries, or in diaspora.

I think that that is actually the main task of "Syndesmos."

That would be my reply. I know that we are all human and can err. But I hope that Mr. Meyendorff, Dr. Zander and all other friends, even if they disagree with me, will kindly forgive me if I really was, or am, too subjective.

VLADIMIR RODZIANKO.

Serbian Orthodox Church of St. Sava,
London.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE FAITH PRESS, LTD., LEIGHTON BUZZARD